

The  
American Historical Review

## THE INCEPTION OF THE BRITISH BOARD OF TRADE

THE old Board of Trade and Plantations came to an end through the demands for economy and reform made by intelligent Englishmen in the later years of the American Revolution. The waste from sinecures and various other forms of political corruption, together with the stupid blundering of placemen high in public service, seemed unbearable at a time when the country was suffering from a heavy burden of debt, taxation, and business stagnation, as well as from defeat.

The champion of the much needed reforms was Edmund Burke. In December, 1779, he was planning a measure that would, he wrote later, bring about "radical, systematic economy; . . . the taking away corruption under the name of general and secret services; the permanent reduction of influence . . . not the reduction of a few places and pensions".<sup>1</sup>

The bill was brought in by Burke February 11, 1780, in a speech that is said to have established his reputation as the first orator of the day.<sup>2</sup> This bill was seconded by Fox, but was lost June 23. The following month Burke wrote: "I exerted myself . . . during the greatest part of a long session . . . with temper and patience, debating and explaining, even after all sort of hope was extinguished, every article of a tedious and intricate detail . . . in defiance of all the official power of the kingdom."<sup>3</sup>

Burke again brought in the bill February 5, 1781; it was lost on the motion for a second reading the twenty-sixth of the same month. It was in support of this measure on the latter date that Pitt, at the age of twenty-one, made his first speech in the House of Commons and won the most unqualified praise from all who heard him. In this speech he declared that "economy was at this time es-

<sup>1</sup> Burke, *Correspondence* (London, 1844), II, 321-334, 339, Burke to Harbord, Apr. 4, 1780.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 335.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 363-367.

entially necessary to national salvation".<sup>4</sup> The next year, as paymaster of the forces in the Rockingham administration, Burke brought in once more his measure for reform, in which he had, however, been forced to make considerable modification in order to secure for it more general support. This bill was passed and did away with "more than forty considerable employments", among them the Board of Trade.<sup>5</sup>

The picture that Burke drew of the history and activities of the Board was doubtless darkened by his prejudices toward that body as he had known it. He described it as "a sort of temperate bed of influence; a sort of gently ripening hothouse where eight members of Parliament receive salaries of a thousand a year, for a certain given time, in order to mature at a proper season, a claim to two thousand".<sup>6</sup> It is difficult to prove now the charge of "jobbery" that he brought against its members. His claim as to the comparative inactivity and uselessness of the Board in its old age, in view of the fact that it was costing perhaps £20,000 a year in upkeep, can be fairly well substantiated from its own records.<sup>7</sup> There had been fifty meetings of the Board in 1779, that is, less than one a week; and at none was there a full attendance. The general laxity was testified to by Edward Gibbon, a member of the Board from 1779 to 1782, when he stated that "our duty was not intolerably severe, and that I enjoyed many days and weeks of repose, without being called away from my library to the office".<sup>8</sup> It was perhaps Burke's attack, together with the influence of the First Lord of Trade appointed November 17, 1779, Frederick, Earl of Carlisle, who was most punctilious in attendance, that inspired a slightly livelier interest on the part of the Lords in 1780. This even extended to their resolving

<sup>4</sup> *The Speeches of William Pitt* (London, 1806), I. 3.

<sup>5</sup> 22 Geo. III., c. 82; Burke, *Corr.*, III. 14. Wraxall says that the actual saving effected was £72,000 in place of the £200,000 proposed two years before. *Historical and Posthumous Memoirs of Sir Nathaniel William Wraxall, 1772-1784* (London, 1884), II. 281-285.

<sup>6</sup> *Speech of Edmund Burke*, p. 72.

<sup>7</sup> Wraxall, in illustrating the abuses and "depredations" practised in many official departments, cites a Lord of Trade as one of the most unblushing offenders he had known. *Memoirs*, III. 104. When planning his reform bill in 1779 Burke noted: "The Board of Trade, (as wholly useless and very mischievous,) to be suppressed;—a saving of about £20,000 a year." *Corr.*, II. 325. In his speech of Feb. 11, 1780, cited above, he said: "it is a board which, if not mischievous, is of no use at all."

<sup>8</sup> Public Record Office, C. O. 391:86. *Memoirs of Edward Gibbon* (New York and London, 1900), p. 207.



that more "due and regular attendance" of the clerks in their employ should be exacted.<sup>9</sup>

The principal concern of the Board at that time was with routine colonial administration.<sup>10</sup> Burke accused it justly of having no share in important measures that should have come within its jurisdiction. All that by any stretch of the imagination could be called consideration of foreign trade during 1779 that appears in their journal concerned the export of ordnance and stores for the equipment of certain ships being fitted out in Portugal and Holland, the importation of turpentine from a cargo at Bordeaux, and the receipt of papers respecting British and French imports at Hamburg.<sup>11</sup>

Reading the minutes of the Board for their last years one is impressed with the mechanical, cut-and-dried character of the business transacted and with the absence of constructive vitality. Time was soon to prove, however, that simply returning to the Privy Council the business of the defunct Board was not enough. The growing commerce and industry of Great Britain, as well as the needs of her colonies, called for more detailed attention and fostering care than could be given by the Privy Council as a whole.

In the years that immediately followed the suppression of the Board, no other question involving either trade or plantations was so important as that concerning the problem of the readjustment of commercial relations with the American colonies that had won their independence. Especially urgent was the need for regulating the trade of the United States with the loyal British colonies in America. The Navigation Acts recognized only two territorial divisions, European states on the one hand and their plantations in America, Asia, and Africa on the other. An independent American state was an unprecedented anomaly. Since there were no traditions to follow, either a new policy had to be evolved or the old colonial system continued with the fewest possible necessary changes.

The one English statesman who had a plan to propose that might wisely adapt England's commercial traditions to the demands of the new world conditions was William Pitt. In 1782 he became chancellor of the Exchequer in the Shelburne ministry. In February, 1783,

<sup>9</sup> C. O. 391: 87, p. 59. A member of the Board who must have been of the type that excited Burke's ire was Lord Robert Spencer, according to the Journal. He appeared at only eight meetings in 1779; at seven in 1780; and at none in 1781.

<sup>10</sup> Mary P. Clarke says that it was scarcely more than an "informative bureau" even during the more active period of its existence: "The Board had the power of a subcommittee coupled with the outward form of a Council of State," "The Board of Trade at Work", *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XVII, 43.

<sup>11</sup> C. O. 391: 86, pp. 55, 182, 197, 215, 219, 227, 233, 234.

Shelburne resigned, and the first of April Pitt too went out of office. It was during this interim, while still a member of a disintegrating ministry, that Pitt in March introduced a bill for temporarily regulating trade with America. Freedom was to be given American ships to export American goods to the West Indies and to take back colonial produce in return. Had Pitt been stronger at this time he might have established commercial relations with America on a broad basis. But he went out of office without having been able to win adequate support for his measure, and by the time he returned the current had settled into the narrow channel it was to follow for many years.<sup>12</sup>

The coalition ministry of Fox, North, and Portland pursued a hand-to-mouth policy that is not to be wondered at, considering that it contained no statesman of real constructive ability and that its tenure of office was insecure. The measures actually adopted seem to have been the result of the least possible forethought or deliberate planning.<sup>13</sup> When it came to making regulations regarding this "complicated and hitherto unexplained subject", Parliament decided to delegate the duty. This it did by an act enabling the king in Council to regulate trade and commerce with America by orders to be issued from time to time.

In consequence of this act a series of orders in Council was issued in 1783 that formulated the general conditions on which commercial intercourse with America was continued for many years.<sup>14</sup> So far as England herself was concerned the United States was practically returned to the colonial relationship of furnishing the former the raw

<sup>12</sup> The American commissioners for peace in Paris recognized this possibility. Adams wrote to Livingston in June: "If Shelburne, Townshend, Pitt, etc., had continued we should have had everything settled long ago to our entire satisfaction, and to the infinite advantage of Great Britain and America, in such a manner as would have restored good humor and affection as far as in the nature of things they can now be restored." Wharton, *Diplomatic Correspondence*, VI. 505. Cf. "Observations of London Merchants on American Trade, 1783", a document found at Orwell Park in 1912 by J. Franklin Jameson and printed with interpretive comments in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XVIII. 769-780. These show clearly the steps taken by Pitt in the spring of 1783.

<sup>13</sup> The spirit animating them was well expressed by Reeves, for many years the legal adviser of the Committee of Trade: "Notwithstanding the American colonies had been separated from this country, and their independence acknowledged by the peace of 1783, we cannot avoid placing them, with regard to their trade, among our plantations." *Law of Shipping and Navigation*, second ed., p. 265. Fox told Laurens he was in favor of opening West India trade but there were "many parties to please". Wharton, *Dipl. Corr.*, VI. 639.

<sup>14</sup> These orders of May 14, June 6, July 2, and Dec. 26, 1783, are discussed at length by Reeves, *Law of Shipping*, pp. 278-282. Cf. the discussion of the order of July 2 by H. C. Bell, in "British Commercial Policy in the West Indies, 1783-1793", *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXXI. 435 (July, 1916).

products she needed and receiving her manufactures in return. As to the old-time trade with the West Indies that had been so lucrative and seemingly necessary, the United States was put on the same basis as any other foreign power. Any participation in this trade was forbidden to American shipping and the articles to be exported or imported in British shipping were carefully circumscribed with a view to British interests only.<sup>15</sup>

Meanwhile certain mercantile interests were not silent while measures were being adopted that affected them so closely. Those most concerned with the question were the West India planters and merchants. Rich and well organized, they were influential enough to make themselves heard in the highest quarters.<sup>16</sup> Representations had been made by the planters and merchants to the government on April 11, and by the merchants on November 20, 1783. At a meeting of the Committee of West India Planters and Merchants held February 6, 1784, Lord Penrhyn, the chairman, reported that in consequence of the minutes of the last meeting he had repeatedly attended Mr. Pitt, and was authorized to communicate to the meeting the readiness of the king's ministers to do everything in their power for the assistance and relief of the sugar colonies consistent with the interests of the mother country. A resolution was then unanimously adopted "setting forth the distressed state of His Majesty's sugar colonies with respect to the intercourse between His Majesty's West India Islands and the United States of America under the present

<sup>15</sup> Lord Sheffield made a vigorous attack upon Pitt's bill when it was before the House. His widely read pamphlet, *Observations on the Commerce of the American States*, undoubtedly influenced the policy adopted. In this he said (p. 29) that the only "use and advantage" of the American colonies or West India islands to Great Britain were "the monopoly of their consumption; and of the carriage of their produce. Rather than give up their carrying trade it would be better to give up themselves".

<sup>16</sup> Their principal spokesman was Bryan Edwards. Of Pitt's bill he said: "had it passed into law, [it] would, I am persuaded, have tended in its consequences, not to the injury of our trade and navigation, as was apprehended, but, in a very eminent degree, to the support and encouragement of both." *Thoughts on the late Proceedings of Government* (London, 1784), p. 5. The minutes of the Committee are in existence since 1769. Mr. Beeston Long, afterwards chairman of the London Dock Company, was one of the earliest chairmen, and among those who regularly attended the meetings were Sir Alexander Grant; Samuel Turner, lord mayor of London in 1769; and Alderman Trecothick and Alderman Hopkins, both of whom were subsequently lord mayor. Meetings were held at various taverns and coffee-houses and at one period in a palatial suite of rooms at the West India Club House, 60 St. James Street. The committee contributed largely to charity, though hardly under that category would come a considerable sum subscribed toward publishing a pamphlet on *The Salubrious Qualities of Rum in preference to Brandy*. Aspinall, *The British West Indies*.

regulations for carrying on trade and commerce, and praying relief therein".<sup>17</sup>

Pitt had become prime minister in December, 1783. That his opinions expressed earlier in the year had not changed is shown by a speech made November 11, 1783, in which he said:

The nation has a right to expect that, without delay, a complete commercial system, suited to the novelty of our situation, will be laid before Parliament. I am acquainted with the difficulty of the business and will not attribute the delay hitherto to any neglect on the part of the present Ministers. I am willing to ascribe it to the nature of the negotiations; but I expect that the business will soon be brought forward, not by piecemeal, but that one grand system of commerce, built on the circumstances of the times, will be submitted to the House for their consideration.<sup>18</sup>

However strong his own conviction may have been, Pitt was far from being able at that time to carry out a revolutionary commercial policy in face of the determined opposition that he was encountering. Until the dissolution of Parliament on March 24, 1784, his government was fighting for its life against the determined assaults of Fox, Lord North, and their followers. It was at a time when votes of censure were being carried against him, the impeachment of his ministers was threatened, and votes of supplies were hindered that Pitt had to consider the representation of the West India planters and merchants. The occasion was not favorable for leading a forlorn hope. What Pitt did was to appoint a committee of Council on March 5, 1784, to which three days later was referred the consideration of this petition. From its first meeting, on March 5, to May 31, a period of twelve weeks during which twenty-four meetings were held, no other business was considered. The matter in hand was gone into thoroughly. The Committee inquired into the steps taken in both the United States and the French West Indies in consequence of the British commercial regulations of 1783.<sup>19</sup> It examined evi-

<sup>17</sup> Board of Trade Papers, 5: 1, pp. 1-4.

<sup>18</sup> *Parliamentary Register*, XII, 10-11. This sounds like a follower of Adam Smith. Pitt declared later that the great economist had given to the world the best solution to all commercial and economic questions. Adam Smith wrote in December, 1783: "My own opinion is that it should be allowed to go on as before, and whatever inconveniences may result from this freedom may be remedied as they occur. The lumber and provisions of the United States are more necessary to our West India Islands, than the rum and sugar of the latter are to the former. Any interruption or restraint of commerce would hurt our loyal much more than our revolted subjects." Auckland, *Journal and Correspondence*, I, 64.

<sup>19</sup> A proclamation of Damas, governor of Martinique, opening French ports of the sugar islands to American commerce is printed in English on the same sheet with the order in Council of July 2, 1783. B. T. 6: 84, no. 145. In testimony before the Committee in 1794 the terms were given of the *Arrêt* of the Council of State, Aug. 30, 1784, of similar import. B. T. 5: 9, p. 131.

dence as to the possibility of supplying the British West Indies from Canada, Nova Scotia, and St. John; whether such supplies should be conveyed by vessels from Great Britain, the North American colonies, or the West Indian colonies; and also whether supplies from the United States could not be brought to the islands in other than vessels of the United States. A considerable number of witnesses were heard, no small proportion of whom were Loyalists. Addresses from assemblies, letters from governors and others, abstracts of prices, accounts of importations, and shipping lists were among the papers read.

The evidence thus obtained was naturally contradictory. The governors of the islands could view the privations of the planter with a much more judicious eye than could the planters themselves. Those interested in the North American colonies saw wonderful possibilities in their future productiveness.<sup>20</sup> The Loyalists would not willingly have any favor granted the Americans. Between the fears of those who mistrusted American commercial enterprise, if given free play, and the hopes of those who might profit from restricting it, the West Indians naturally lost. It must also be kept in mind that a committee made up largely of seasoned politicians, several of whom were hostile to America, could scarcely have been expected to upset long established traditions, when a leader like Fox fought as he did the following year for the "sacredness" of the Navigation Acts.

The report made May 31 covers fifty pages. Together with the inquiry it takes up the entire first volume of the Board of Trade Minutes. It is in many respects an excellent résumé of trade conditions in America, in the West Indies, and between the United States and countries other than England, and also contains much information as to the rum traffic. The conclusions reached by the Committee were absolutely in accord with the policy laid down in the orders in Council of 1783, and with the time-honored principles of the navigation system.

Pitt, having turned the matter over to the Committee, abided by its decision. The Committee was composed of men whose opinions could not be lightly ignored, and Pitt was exceedingly busy with other weighty problems. He was also somewhat disillusioned as time went on and more ready to compromise with those from whom he differed.

<sup>20</sup> Sir Guy Carleton in his testimony expressed the opinion that within two years New Brunswick could produce enough lumber for her own use and that of the West Indies. Seven years later, in 1791, he stated that New Brunswick still required permission from time to time to import supplies of grain and provisions from the United States and that he had been induced to permit also the importation of lumber. *B. T.* 5:7, p. 389.

The new Committee may have been appointed primarily to deal with the question of American intercourse; an intention to create a more permanent body is indicated, however, in its title, "The Committee of Council appointed for the consideration of all matters relating to Trade and Foreign Plantations". The minutes are usually headed "The Lords and others of the Committee of Council appointed by His Majesty for the consideration of, etc. . . ." or occasionally "By the Right Honorables, the Lords of the Committee, etc." In its papers it is sometimes referred to, even in the earlier years, as the "Board" or the "Board of Trade".

It is most likely that the Committee was at first in the nature of an experiment. Pitt had great plans in mind, for which he needed a solid basis of fact on which to build. These plans were far-reaching as well as novel to the England of his day, and if he was to carry the country with him it would be necessary to sound public opinion on the part of those most concerned. Furthermore his first care was to put England on a stable financial basis, and to do this every encouragement needed to be given to its industrial, commercial, and colonial interests. The act abolishing the old Board of Trade provided that a committee of Council might take over the business done by it and all authority and jurisdiction that Parliament had at any time vested in it. With this as the point of departure, Pitt created the simplest organization possible and left it to time to determine what should be its permanent form and personnel.

The first Committee, appointed March 5, 1784, consisted of thirteen members: Lord Sydney, who heads the list as one of the "principal Secretaries of State", the Earls of Effingham and Clarendon, Lord Walsingham, Lord Frederick Campbell, Lord Grantham, Lord Grantley, Sir Joseph Yorke, Charles Jenkinson, Henry Dundas, W. W. and James Grenville, and Thomas Harley.<sup>21</sup> To these were added on March 8, Sir John Goodricke and Viscount Howe; on June 11, Lord Mulgrave; December 9, 1785, William Eden; January 1, 1786, William Pitt; and January 13, the Marquis of Carmarthen. This was certainly not an undistinguished group of men and probably constituted the best that Pitt had at his disposal for such service.

Lord Sydney was secretary for home affairs, the Marquis of Carmarthen, for foreign affairs; Viscount Howe, first lord of the Admiralty; W. W. Grenville and Lord Mulgrave, joint paymasters of

<sup>21</sup> The list in the preface to B. T. 5: 1 also includes Lord de Ferrers, that to B. T. 5: 2, the Earl of Leicester, neither of whom seems to have attended. The order in Council of Mar. 5, as given in the Privy Council Register for 1784, includes the Earl of Aylesford, the Bishop of London, Lord de Ferrers, and William Wyndham, while it omits W. W. Grenville.

the forces; and Henry Dundas, treasurer of the navy. Lord Frederick Campbell, a son of the Duke of Argyll, had been a member of the Privy Council since 1765, and for nearly forty years, 1767-1816, was lord clerk register for Scotland; Lord Grantham, after serving with distinction as ambassador at Madrid 1771-1779, had been appointed to the Board of Trade in 1780 and was foreign secretary under Shelburne; Lord Grantley was solicitor general in 1762, attorney general in 1763, and speaker of the House 1770-1780; Sir Joseph Yorke represented Great Britain at the Hague for twenty-nine years, 1751-1780.<sup>22</sup> Jenkinson had begun his political career as a protégé of George Grenville, of Stamp Act fame, and soon became private secretary to Lord Bute. From the time he entered the House of Commons, in 1761, till the overthrow of Lord North's government, he held a series of public offices.<sup>23</sup> After Bute's retirement he led the group known in the Commons as the king's friends.

In view of the fact that the judgment of these men determined the question of commercial relations with the United States, it is perhaps well to review what the previous attitude of some of them had been toward America. The name of Viscount Howe speaks for itself. Lord Grantley, who, in spite of his achievements, was violent-tempered and unprincipled, had in the debates on the Stamp Act in 1766 accused the elder Pitt of sounding the trumpet to rebellion and declared that his very blood was chilled at the idea. Dundas had been particularly virulent in his attacks on the colonists.<sup>24</sup> Sir Joseph Yorke had been removed by his absence in Holland from the struggles preceding the Revolution, but had won for himself a reputation for harsh and unreasoning prejudice against the French, and his haughty temper had probably not been improved by the necessity he was under of leaving Holland after it had joined the Franco-American Alliance.

In Jenkinson, however, the chief interest lies, not only because he was the most faithful member of the Committee, but also because of his long continued leadership in its activities. He had raised himself by his own efforts from a position of obscurity to one of the most influential positions in England through assiduous devotion to Lord Bute, Lord North, and the king.<sup>25</sup> He was selfish, ungrateful, and

<sup>22</sup> *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

<sup>23</sup> *Memoirs of the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Liverpool* (London, 1827). This biography of the more famous second earl gives a brief account of his father, Charles Jenkinson, the first earl of Liverpool.

<sup>24</sup> Horace Walpole, *Last Journals*, with notes by Dr. Doran (1910), I. 441.

<sup>25</sup> In 1761 Jenkinson wrote to Grenville: "I am absolutely in love with Lord Bute; his goodness shows itself to me more and more every day." *Grenville Pa-*



grasping; he had no trace of wit, humor, or imagination; on the other hand, he was well educated, patient, industrious, and skilled in public affairs. Probably no other man of his time in England was more unpopular, largely because of the baneful influence he was supposed to have with the king. He was notorious for the vindictive spirit he had shown toward America, was popularly believed to have devised the Stamp Act in order to bring matters to an issue, and as secretary at war during the last years of the American Revolution had the difficult task of getting the army estimates accepted by the House of Commons.<sup>26</sup>

Knowing Pitt's liberal attitude toward America one may well ask why he appointed Jenkinson on the Committee. Perhaps he did not realize how quickly the latter would assume its leadership and mold it to his opinions. Certain it is that Pitt needed help in the perilous spring of 1784 and did not dare to be too critical in choosing his supporters. Since the fall of Lord North, Jenkinson had been quietly, inconspicuously biding his time and was at hand, ready to be used. His capacity for labor, his meticulous care for detail,<sup>27</sup> and his long experience quickly made him a useful, and soon an almost invaluable, aid to the young, overworked premier. Such a connection, however, was naturally not overlooked by the enemies of the government and Pitt himself recognized that it was not above criticism.

Late in 1784 Lord Sydney, in a letter to the Postmaster General on behalf of the Committee, said that its organization was only a temporary one, until the business of the department could be finally settled and put on a permanent basis.<sup>28</sup> There are also two letters written by Pitt in the summer of 1786 in which he states that he is making some necessary arrangements to put more regularity and despatch into the business of government and that the first step is to give a regular and permanent establishment to the Committee of Council for Trade, "which becomes every day more and more important".<sup>29</sup>

*pers.*, I. 359. The *Rolliad* dubbed him the drudge of Bute; Walpole called him Lord Bute's creature, and one of the Secret Junto. *Last Journals*, I. 164.

<sup>26</sup> *Grenville Papers*, III. 393; Auckland, *Jour. and Corr.*, I. 236, III. 248; *Wraxall, Memoirs*, I. 46; Stanhope, *Life of Pitt*, I. 149; Walpole, *Last Journals*, I. 319, 419, 442, II. 449, 494. Also a pamphlet entitled *A Letter to the Rt. Hon. Charles Jenkinson, signed an Independent Whig* (1781). After Pitt's accession to power he would allow no one to come between him and the king.

<sup>27</sup> These traits were markedly shown in his writings. A treatise of his, *The Coins of the Realm*, was reprinted by the Bank of England in 1880.

<sup>28</sup> B. T. 5: 2, 53.

<sup>29</sup> Stanhope, *Life of Pitt*, I. 306; *Correspondence between Pitt and the Duke of Rutland, 1781-1787*, p. 160.



On August 23, 1786, the order in Council was issued that permanently organized the Committee by dissolving the former one and declaring that the new one should be composed of certain *ex-officio* and appointed members. The former were to consist of the archbishop of Canterbury, the first commissioners of the Treasury and of the Admiralty, the principal secretaries of state, the chancellor and under-treasurer of the Exchequer, and the speaker of the House of Commons; such members of the Privy Council as held the offices of chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, paymaster of the forces, treasurer of the navy, or master of the mint; the speaker of the House of Commons of Ireland and those who held office in Ireland and were also members of Privy Council. The members appointed by name were Lord Frederick Campbell, Lord Grantley, Sir Joseph Yorke, Sir John Goodricke, William Eden, J. Grenville, and Thomas Harley, all members of the former Committee; Robert Lowth, bishop of London, Sir Lloyd Kenyon, master of the rolls, and Thomas Orde.<sup>30</sup> Nor were these for the most part merely nominal appointments. Of the ninety-nine meetings held in the year following the reorganization, Lord Hawkesbury attended every one; W. W. Grenville, ninety-four; Pitt, fifty-eight; and the Archbishop of Canterbury, eight.

As Jenkinson had recently been made chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster he came into the reorganized Committee on the basis of an *ex-officio* member, and was appointed its first president.<sup>31</sup> Two days before he had been raised to the peerage as Baron Hawkesbury. It was with some reluctance that Pitt bestowed these honors, but he looked upon them as fair rewards for service rendered. Nor did rewards end here. Pitt's preoccupation with public affairs became so great that dinners, evenings not spent in the Commons, and week-ends, became largely a matter of business, and in this semi-social way Hawkesbury came to have an important share in his life. Gradually the latter became an attendant at Cabinet meetings, until it became a question of formal membership for him. There was a sharp dispute between them on this point early in 1791, in which Pitt ultimately yielded and wrote to the king, proposing that Hawkesbury enter the

<sup>30</sup> B. T. 5:4, 1. Thomas Orde, chief secretary to the Duke of Rutland, was most helpful to Pitt in the matter of commercial union with Ireland. He became Baron Bolton in 1787.

<sup>31</sup> W. W. Grenville was appointed vice-president. He was sent on important diplomatic missions to the Hague and Paris in 1787, became speaker of the House of Commons in 1789, succeeded the Duke of Leeds as foreign secretary in 1791 and as Lord Grenville became leader of the government in the House of Lords.

Cabinet as president of the Board of Trade.<sup>32</sup> Finally, in 1795, he was created Earl of Liverpool. Though crippled by serious illness in the later years of his life he attended meetings of the Committee till late in 1802, and was not replaced as its president until June, 1804.<sup>33</sup>

Notwithstanding its reorganization in 1786 the Committee for Trade has had a practically unbroken existence from 1784 till the present time, for the Board of Trade, as it has been known since 1861, is still constituted on much the same basis.<sup>34</sup> The records from March 5, 1784, are catalogued as Board of Trade Papers, and the fact that with these are a few of those of the old Board of Trade and Plantations links it up with that organization.<sup>35</sup> Its minutes occasionally refer to it as the Board or even as the Board of Trade.<sup>36</sup> There is no question that the Committee considered itself the successor of the old Board for transacting the business formerly done by it. And as the business of the Committee appointed March 5, 1784, was referred to the reorganized one, there was in 1786 no break in continuity. It differed from the Board of Trade and Plantations in being nominally at least a committee of the Privy Council and not an independent organization, in having a larger membership of no fixed number, and in not having its members paid as such. It had the same functions of inquiry and report as had its predecessor and exercised these, as well as other activities, over a vastly wider field, with a diligence and an assurance quite lacking in the later years of the earlier body.

The Committee began its work in 1784 without the assistance of an office staff of its own. Two of the clerks of the Privy Council, Stephen Cottrell and William Fawkener, esquires, acted as its secre-

<sup>32</sup> *Political Memoranda of Francis, Fifth Duke of Leeds*, ed. Oscar Browning (1884), pp. 137, 138, 140; Duke of Buckingham, *Memoirs of the Courts and Cabinets of George III.* (1853), II. 187; Chatham MSS., vols. CI. and CLII. In 1801, Lord Liverpool and his son were both members of the Addington ministry, the latter as secretary for foreign affairs.

<sup>33</sup> June 7, 1804, the Duke of Montrose was appointed president, and George Rose, vice-president of the Committee. B. T. 5: 14, p. 272.

<sup>34</sup> The order in Council of Aug. 23, 1786, is still in force. *Introd. to Lists and Indexes*, no. XLVI. (Public Record Office), p. x, Board of Trade. I have found no evidence that the Committee of 1786 was known until 1861 as the Board of Trade and Plantations, as stated in C. M. Andrews, *Guide to Materials for Am. Hist. to 1783 in the Public Record Office*, I. 103.

<sup>35</sup> The papers of the Committee preserved in the Public Record Office are catalogued under six heads. B. T. 1 comprises In-Letters from September, 1791, to December, 1837, in 336 vols.; B. T. 2, In-Letters, Foreign Office, 1833-1837, 9 vols.; B. T. 3, Out-Letters from August, 1786, to September, 1835, 26 vols.; B. T. 4, Reference books to In-Letters, September, 1808, to 1835; B. T. 5, Minutes from March, 1784, to August, 1837, 44 vols.; and B. T. 6, Miscellanea.

<sup>36</sup> B. T. 5: 18, 242.

taries and continued to serve in this double capacity for many years.<sup>37</sup> When the Committee was reorganized in 1786 it was directed to "consider their officers, etc., and the salaries to be allowed". George Chalmers, esquire, was appointed chief clerk, a position that he held until his death in 1825.<sup>38</sup> Under him were five clerks, whose number had increased to eight by 1812. Perhaps the most important appointment made by the Committee was that in 1787 of a law clerk in the person of John Reeves. He held his position with the Committee till 1823, "when upwards of seventy years of age". His advice was continually called for and ably given, while his assistance was particularly valuable in preparing the drafts of acts of Parliament. The knowledge and experience gained in this connection served as the basis for his well-known treatise, *The Law of Shipping and Navigation*.<sup>39</sup>

The meetings of the Committee were held, as had been those of the old Board of Trade, in the Treasury Building. During the first somewhat tentative two years and five months of its existence it probably met as any committee of Council would have done. The minutes were headed "At the Council Chamber, Whitehall," a nomenclature that was continued for many years. In 1786 it was assigned permanent apartments for which Messrs. Haig and Chippendale provided the furniture.

<sup>37</sup> B. T. 5: 18, 212. William Fawkener came of an old merchant family of London. His father was a friend of Voltaire, who spent the greater part of the period 1726-1729 with him and dedicated his tragedy *Zaire* to him; he was knighted in 1735, sent as ambassador to Constantinople, and was joint postmaster general from 1745 till his death in 1758. William was secretary to Carmarthen when the latter went as ambassador to France in February, 1783, and was sent on a diplomatic mission to Berlin and St. Petersburg in 1791. Leeds, *Political Memoranda*, pp. 78, 162. Pitt considered him very able but bad-tempered. *Pitt-Rutland Corr.*, p. 130. There are several letters from Fawkener to Pitt written 1792-1795 in which he lays claim to a pension additional to the one Lord Bute had given him in 1762 in consideration of his father's services. Pitt objected to his receiving a pension while holding office, to which Fawkener replied: "The instances of pensions so held, or of sinecure places, in addition to the most lucrative offices, are so numerous, in the higher as well as the lower departments of government, that whoever might be disposed to enumerate them, would be tired very long before he arrived at me." Chatham MSS., vol. CXXXIV.

<sup>38</sup> George Chalmers, F.R.S.A.S., was a lawyer who had lived in Maryland, 1763-1775. As a Loyalist he made an important contribution to the controversy regarding American intercourse in 1784 in his well-known *Opinions*. He wrote a number of biographies and treatises, nearly forty of which are catalogued in the British Museum. In view of his attitude toward America, as well as of his patient industry, he must have been after Jenkinson's own heart.

<sup>39</sup> John Reeves, F. R. S., F. L. S., was the author of a number of historical and legal works.

The primary functions of the Committee were to act as a clearing-house for information for every kind of question relating to trade, and, in the early years, to the colonies; to encourage the shipping and commercial interests of the country; and to furnish legal advice and legislative assistance along these lines. Having obtained the facts, it interpreted or summarized these in forms varying from a brief letter to a large printed report. Consideration was given to the desirability of the renewal of expiring laws. Proposed acts were referred to them, while the drawing up, putting through Parliament, and issuing of instructions for carrying out new legislation was no inconsiderable task. Preparing the ground for commercial treaties, the consideration and even the legislation necessary to carry treaties into effect, constituted another important phase of its work.

While the Committee was probably intended to act only in an advisory capacity there was a decided tendency even in its earlier days toward executive action, though this only slowly won full recognition in later years. Like other tendencies, this one is difficult of definite proof. There are, however, many partly illustrative instances. On June 7, 1797, the Earl of Liverpool assured the governor and deputy-governor of the Bank that in consequence of their communication the Committee had directed that a bill be prepared for preventing the circulation and counterfeiting of dollars or any other coin whatsoever. Two years later he sent a letter to Pitt regarding the importation of grain, in which he said: "The measures I recommend can be carried into execution only by an Order of the King in Council and I wish however, to know, whether you have any objection to this proposition, that I may have the proper orders prepared and in readiness, in case there should be a Council held at Weymouth."<sup>40</sup>

The work of the Committee which most nearly linked up its functions with those of the old Board of Trade was that which related to the colonies. There was scarcely a phase of colonial administration which was not referred to the Committee in the first few years of its existence.

Its control over colonial officials was none the less effective because it was indirect. Drafts of instructions and commissions for

<sup>40</sup> Both these letters are found in the Chatham MSS., vol. CLII. The Committee itself made an interesting differentiation in 1808 when it said regarding licenses that "the executive part of the Business, as to making out the Orders, etc.", should be left "to the Council Office; but the Minutes of the Committee of Privy Council, the References to the different Boards, and the necessary correspondence to devolve on the new clerks under the immediate inspection and control of this Board". B. T. 5:18, 242.

governors were drawn up, and dealt not only with questions of trade but with various colonial interests. For instance, when the settlement of Loyalists in the Bahama Islands called for changes there, the Committee prepared in August, 1784, a new draft of additional instructions for the governor providing for a new council, composed of persons whose names were inserted; extending to other islands the privilege of sending representatives to the assembly; and containing terms for the allotment of land.<sup>41</sup> Complaints against governors and questions as to granting discretionary powers to them were frequently considered.

The colonial judiciary also came under their control. In 1789 the establishment of courts in Antigua was taken up at length, and in 1790 that of a court of civil jurisdiction in Newfoundland. In 1787 the Committee directed the advocate general to prepare a commission for the trial of pirates in New South Wales and furnished a list of names of members to be inserted; in October, 1784, similar steps had been taken in regard to piracy in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and there too the names of the commissioners had been furnished.<sup>42</sup>

The legislative branch of colonial administration was an especial care of the Committee. The appointment of councillors was approved, or, on the other hand, their removal from office. In the case of the Bahama Islands quoted above a reapportionment of members of the assembly was made, though an act passed in New Brunswick for regular election of the members of the assembly was disallowed.<sup>43</sup> Colonial acts came up regularly for approval or disapproval, thus affording considerable influence over colonial life. As had been the case with the old Board of Trade, this was the most permanent function of the Committee in relation to the colonies.

When Nova Scotia was divided in 1784, the question of the form of government and the expense of the establishment of a separate administration in New Brunswick, and in Cape Breton under Nova Scotia, was decided upon by the Committee, a detailed list of offices and stipends prepared, and devices drawn up for great seals.<sup>44</sup>

Claims to land frequently came up, among them that of Lord Amherst for the grant of the estates formerly belonging to the Jesuits in Canada.<sup>45</sup> The case of the Loyalists was considered under

<sup>41</sup> B. T. 6: 181, 123-124.

<sup>42</sup> B. T. 6: 180, 45-46, 151; B. T. 6: 181, 128, 192; B. T. 6: 182, 107a-119, 231-246.

<sup>43</sup> B. T. 6: 180, 151.

<sup>44</sup> B. T. 6: 181, 92-96.

<sup>45</sup> B. T. 6: 180, 5, 29-35. The report of the Committee was in favor of Lord Amherst's claim.

several forms, one of these being that of southern whale-fishers who had moved from Nantucket, and another that of former officials of Georgia who claimed that their salaries had formerly been paid by annual grant of Parliament, that they had received temporary allowances, but needed further relief.<sup>46</sup> One of the most interesting colonial matters in which the Committee was concerned was the establishment of the bishopric in North America, and this they seem to have carried through in all its details.<sup>47</sup> The encouragement of sugar-growing, rum, etc., and of new forms of productivity in colonial agriculture was of course a natural function of the Committee. The growing of cotton, cloves, and cinnamon, and the introduction of the grape-vine into the West Indies, and the cultivation of hemp in Canada were among the projects considered.

The opening of free ports in the West Indies became of constantly increasing importance after the passage of the act in 1787 for augmenting these. The islands sent in frequent petitions for opening additional ports, while the Committee congratulated itself on the successful character of the trade thus carried on. In February, 1793, their lordships found upon inquiry into the state of the free ports in the West India Islands

that the trade of them has gradually increased to a great amount and is likely to increase still further, and that on this account these free ports are not only highly beneficial to the commerce of Great Britain but that under the regulations to which they are made subject, they contribute greatly to the prosperity of the islands in which they are established, and are in no way detrimental to the interests of the British planters. . . . It is their Lordships wish to permit importation into these ports of any additional articles, the produce of Spanish, Portuguese or French Colonies, which will not materially interfere with present produce of British Islands, for in return for these additional articles a greater quantity of British manufacture will necessarily be sold.<sup>48</sup>

The connection of the Committee with the African Company was based upon the statutes giving certain authority over the company to the old Board of Trade. When a dispute arose over the appointment of Thomas Miles as governor of Anamaboe, the committee of the company did not wish to attend when summoned before the Committee for Trade, but were compelled to do so. They were later told by Lord Hawkesbury, in no uncertain fashion, to consider themselves subject to any directions given by their lordships. The East India

<sup>46</sup> B. T. 6: 181, 106-107; B. T. 6: 182, 281-321.

<sup>47</sup> B. T. 5: 3, 453-454; B. T. 5: 4, 81, 83-84, 101-102, 167, 213, 256-257, 288, 335-336; B. T. 6: 182, 1-6. Cf. "The First Colonial Bishopric, 1786", in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, I, 310-313.

<sup>48</sup> B. T. 5: 8, 380.

Company was also under consideration from time to time, particularly when complaints were made against it.<sup>49</sup>

Commercial relations with the United States continued to be controlled largely by the Committee. The policy adopted in 1783 and approved of in 1784 underwent some development, but practically no change of tendency. The orders in Council governing trade between Great Britain and her colonies, on the one hand, and the United States, on the other, were renewed annually till 1788. Then it was thought that the experience of five years justified putting into permanent form at least those provisions that concerned the United States and the British colonies in North America and the West Indies. The act providing for the regulation of this trade passed by Parliament early in 1788 had been drafted under the most careful supervision of the Committee.<sup>50</sup>

The fact remained, however, that British North America not only failed to satisfy the needs of the British West Indies but could not always supply herself with food. The order in Council permitting the importation of certain food-stuffs from the United States to Newfoundland was annually renewed by the advice of the Committee, and Canada and New Brunswick were at times unable to provide for their own wants.<sup>51</sup>

The privations of the colonists would have been still greater had not smuggling been carried on. The attempt through enforcement of the Navigation Laws to coerce into British channels the long established and mutually profitable trade between the different parts of the English-speaking population of the New World naturally met with many and devious circumventions, complaints of which came to the Committee from time to time. This illicit trade had its share in bringing about the revision of the laws of shipping in 1786. One result for America of the careful consideration then given the subject was the provision in the annual order of 1786 that after January 1, 1787, American ships must be American built as well as American owned, and with master and three-fourths of the crew American subjects.<sup>52</sup> Smuggling was not ended, however. Advantage was taken of the free ports, both British and foreign; of the trade in salt at Turks Island; of counterfeit Mediterranean passes and of falsified

<sup>49</sup> B. T. 5: 7, 309, 318, 325, 422; B. T. 5: 5, 69, 82, etc. The index of B. T. 5: 7 has a page on the East India Company.

<sup>50</sup> 28 Geo. III., c. 6; B. T. 5: 4, 382, 420; B. T. 5: 5, 16-18.

<sup>51</sup> B. T. 5: 6, 10; B. T. 5: 8, 389, etc.

<sup>52</sup> Reeves, *Law of Shipping*, p. 284.



certificates.<sup>53</sup> The Committee was even troubled by the conduct of Americans in clandestinely carrying from Cape Breton large quantities of plaster of Paris.<sup>54</sup>

After the outbreak of war in 1793, the Committee came to conclude, to some extent at least, the conduct of the governors of the West India Islands who found it necessary to allow the importation of provisions and lumber, and the export of produce in exchange for them, in foreign vessels. An indemnifying act for such "irregular but necessary traffic", as Reeves calls it, was accordingly passed and renewed annually till the Peace of Amiens.<sup>55</sup>

In another direction there was a slight variation in the customary policy of the Committee. Evidence had been given at the inquiry of 1784 that "the best oak in America for shipbuilding grows on the banks of Lake Champlain and cannot be brought to market in any other way than by the rivers Sorel and St. Lawrence". Accordingly when the trade between the British colonies in North America and the United States was first regulated in 1785, though all commerce by sea was forbidden so far as Quebec was concerned, provision was made for legalizing overland trade with the Lake Champlain region. By the advice of the Committee, no peltry, rum or spirits were to be exported, and no goods not the produce of the United States imported.<sup>56</sup>

When Ethan Allen and his brothers led the attempt of certain people in Vermont to obtain free trade, perhaps even political union, with Great Britain, the problem was eventually referred to the Committee.<sup>57</sup> In their report, made on April 17, 1790, they say that having repeatedly taken the subject into consideration they are

confirmed in the Opinion they before entertained that it will be adviseable, in a commercial, and, they may add, in a political view also to permit, and

<sup>53</sup> B. T. 5: 5, 132, 138, 158; B. T. 5: 6, 254, 278, 333. 28 Geo. III., c. 6 forbade even enumerated articles that could be imported directly from the United States, in British shipping, to be brought from the free ports of foreign West India Islands except in an emergency. Ships of the United States coming in ballast to Turks Island might carry away salt only. These were regulations particularly liable to evasion. The report on shipping, B. T. 5: 3, 286-333, contains interesting evidence from both Nelson and Collingwood regarding fraud in the West Indies.

<sup>54</sup> B. T. 5: 7, 81.

<sup>55</sup> Reeves, *Law of Shipping*, p. 302.

<sup>56</sup> These conditions were embodied in 28 Geo. III., c. 6. Lieut.-Gov. Haldimand had testified that if peltry were allowed to go into the United States the British merchants would have to pay higher prices, as Americans were willing to pay more. B. T. 6: 181, 170.

<sup>57</sup> The letter from Lord Grenville turning the matter over to the Committee is given by S. F. Bemis, in "The Vermont Separatists and Great Britain", in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXI, 554.



even encourage all Articles, being the Growth and Produce of the Countries bordering upon Canada, to be brought into the said Province in exchange for British Merchandize and Manufactures, and to be Exported from thence down the River St. Lawrence, in British Ships to those parts of Europe or America where the Produce of Canada of the same sort may be legally carried.<sup>58</sup>

Meanwhile Parliament was passing every year an enabling act by which orders in Council continued to regulate the trade between Great Britain and the United States. So long as the Articles of Confederation was the only bond uniting the states, Great Britain looked with great complacency on the apparent success of her policy. Not until the first Congress elected under the new Constitution had shown some spirit of retaliation, did the English government pay much heed to the American point of view. On September 30, 1789, the American Tonnage and Import Acts, passed by the American Congress in July of that year, were referred to the Committee and on November 12 the Duke of Leeds, foreign secretary, asked it to take into consideration "what proposals of a commercial nature it may be proper to make to the United States of America".<sup>59</sup> The results of the inquiry thus set on foot were printed as a lengthy report January 28, 1791, which is a most valuable summary of trade conditions as they had existed between Great Britain and the United States since 1783.<sup>60</sup>

After showing the extent to which English shipping had apparently prospered under their policy the

Committee are inclined to think, that it may be advisable for your Majesty to consent to open a negotiation with the United States for the purpose of making a commercial treaty, especially as Congress appears inclined to this measure. But it will be right, in an early stage of this negotiation, explicitly to declare, that Great Britain can never submit even to treat on what appears to be the favourite object of the People of these states, that is, the admission of the ships of the United States into the ports of your Majesty's colonies and islands.<sup>61</sup>

The report clearly betrays distrust of America as a shipping rival, though it quite frankly recognized the advisability of a more conciliatory attitude in dealing with states now united and of strengthening and increasing the party in America favorable to Great Britain.

<sup>58</sup> B. T. 6: 180, 130-149. This report was published by F. J. Turner in 1902 in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, VIII. 78-86.

<sup>59</sup> B. T. 5: 6, p. 38; B. T. 5: 7, p. 63.

<sup>60</sup> B. T. 6: 182, 272, notes that the report upon the American Import and Tonnage Acts was printed. It contains 101 pages, besides 57 pages of appendixes. It was reprinted in 1807. W. C. Ford edited in 1888 an abstract of this report that was found among the Jefferson Papers.

<sup>61</sup> *Report*, p. 98.

The Committee took charge of the legislation necessary for carrying into effect the commercial treaty with America.<sup>62</sup> There is evidence that Lord Hawkesbury had had a share in making it and that he remained implacable in regard to opening the West India trade to the United States.<sup>63</sup>

When we turn to the business of the Committee that had to do more closely with domestic affairs we find it at its best and at its worst. The encouragement of trade and commerce was pursued along traditional lines with all of Hawkesbury's narrow-minded zeal. On the other hand, his better qualities also were shown in ways that were to give permanent form to the work of the Committee. His careful, patient labor in getting information; the eye for little things as well as great; and the constant contact with the men who made up the shipping, mercantile, and manufacturing interests of the country, were of lasting value. In consequence the Committee solidly established itself as a necessary and useful part of government that did good service in helping Pitt to restore England to a sound financial basis.

The Navigation Acts were the especial care of the Committee. During 1785-1786 there was a revisal of these laws, especially in the tightening up of their application to foreign shipping as seen in the Ship's Register Act. Not only did the Committee consider the subject at length, but Jenkinson did valuable work in putting the measures through Parliament.<sup>64</sup>

The fisheries were also extended and encouraged not only as a promising industry but especially because they served as a nursery of

<sup>62</sup> B. T. 5: 10, 234-235, 272.

<sup>63</sup> There is a draft of proposals to be made to Jay in which occurs a suggestion that opening the West India trade might give America an interest in Britain's retaining her newly acquired claims. A marginal note in pencil says: "I am not of this opinion. H." F. O. 95: 512. Hawkesbury wrote later: "I am happy to comply with your Lordship's wishes in giving all the articles of the proposed treaty the best consideration I am able. I have read over the Papers very carefully and you will find written in pencil in the margin of each article such observations as have occurred to me. . . . I have made no observation on the article which relates to the Commercial intercourse between the United States and the West India Islands. I consider this point as irrevocably decided, as against the opinion I have always entertained and publicly professed. . . . I wish for many reasons that if there is to be any further Cabinet on the point, on which we differ, that I may not be summoned to it; my attendance may occasion Discussion which cannot now be of any use." Chatham MSS., CLII.

<sup>64</sup> 26 Geo. III., c. 60. The report is given with appendixes, B. T. 6: 181, pp. 335-396. Reeves said: "It is to the superintendence and authority of this committee and the great knowledge and unwearied exertions of the noble lord at the head of it, that we are indebted for the very important improvements in the law of shipping and navigation." *Law of Shipping*, p. 263.

seamen and of shipping. The fact that a series of laws for regulating the fisheries and granting bounties was near expiration in 1786 served to bring the industry into thoroughgoing consideration. Reports on the Greenland and the southern whale fisheries and on the cod fishery were accordingly made.<sup>65</sup> Jenkinson himself then took charge of the bills in the House of Commons, where in the long discussions he had such a "lucid, well-digested and perspicuous manner, accompanied with details of the most minute description" that he was able to carry his measures through by a large majority.<sup>66</sup> In connection with the Newfoundland fisheries he pointed out the dangers of colonization after the experience with New England. The fact that those most interested in the measures had been given a hearing undoubtedly gained much influential support for them throughout the country, while the information at the disposal of the Committee gave it a solid basis on which to work.

The encouragement of the herring fishery was also undertaken somewhat later.<sup>67</sup> In the minutes for 1791 there is detailed information as to the value and uses of various kinds of fish oils, especially for lighting purposes. The same volume contains the examination of "Captain Joshua of the Ship the *Lord Hawkesbury*" engaged in the southern whale fishery. This ship had recently brought back 76 tons of spermaceti oil and about 360 ounces of ambergris, the largest quantity ever brought to market, and regarding which the captain gave a graphic account.<sup>68</sup>

The questions of aliens' duty, of drawbacks, of bounties, and of quarantine were among those often brought before the Committee, the last-named especially in connection with the Turkey Company and its Levantine trade. With customs there was necessarily the closest co-operation, and many pages in the indexes of the minutes refer to the details of this relationship.<sup>69</sup> After 1793, work in connection with licenses for import and export trade became a heavy burden, especially upon the clerks. In 1789 the Committee made a report on the corn trade, which was to become one of the most im-

<sup>65</sup> B. T. 5:3, 334-349. In 1789 instructions were sent to ministers and consuls in Denmark, Sweden, Holland, Hamburg, and other Hanse towns, to transmit an account of the state and success of the Greenland whale fishery carried on from those countries. B. T. 5:5, 220, 457-469, 471-513.

<sup>66</sup> Wraxall, *Memoirs*, IV, 307.

<sup>67</sup> "Curing red herrings is a very increasing branch of trade . . . not only for foreign export, but in the consumption of this country." B. T. 5:8, 387.

<sup>68</sup> B. T. 5:7, 2, 312.

<sup>69</sup> This was doubtless facilitated by the fact that upon the death of a cousin in 1789 Lord Hawkesbury's good fortune enabled him to secure control of the patent place of collector of the customs inwards. Liverpool, *Memoirs*, p. 10.

portant problems with which it had to deal. During the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars scarcity was sometimes acute in England, and the amount of time devoted to the subject must be some indication of its importance so far as the Committee was concerned.<sup>70</sup>

Every phase of national trade and industry naturally came under the supervision of the Committee, and many reports are embodied in their papers that furnish valuable sources of information regarding these. China and pottery; cotton, hemp, and flax; gunpowder, saltpetre, and dyeing materials; tin, leather, and sugar are items of frequent occurrence, while such products as salt, fur, indigo, silkworms, sal natron, etc., come up occasionally for consideration.<sup>71</sup> Inventions were encouraged and payments or rewards for these were sometimes given.<sup>72</sup> Emigration, especially of artisans, was also considered.<sup>73</sup>

In 1789-1790, a curious case came before the Committee. A certain A. P. Hove had been convinced of his ability to walk through the Guzerāt country in India and so obtain at small expense valuable knowledge regarding its productions and jealously guarded secrets of manufacture. In this project he was so warmly supported by Sir Joseph Banks that the Committee allowed him £300. Once in India, however, he rode instead of walked, and borrowed money by means of bills on Lord Hawkesbury to the amount of £2125. This sum their lordships refused to pay until Sir Joseph Banks persuaded them that Hove had not embezzled a single halfpenny and had brought home a carefully kept journal of observations, as well as many valuable plants and other objects, including a loom with the web in it.<sup>74</sup>

When the embassy to China was preparing to leave in 1792, Lord Macartney wrote to the Committee that the East India Company had appointed one of the largest ships in their service to accompany him. This was done because "they are eager to make every attempt for opening new channels of commerce and for extending the consumption of the manufactures of Great Britain". The Committee arranged that Lord Macartney and such directors of the East India Company as were best acquainted with Chinese customs and com-

<sup>70</sup> B. T. 6: 182, 122-158. A report made on corn. Mar. 8, 1790, *ibid.*, 161-230. B. T. 5: 7 has under "Corn" in the index nearly 9 pp.; B. T. 5: 8, 434 pp.; B. T. 5: 9, over 5 pp.

<sup>71</sup> An excellent account of the fur trade between Nootka Sound, China, and India was given by Lieut. John Meares in 1790. B. T. 5: 6, 225.

<sup>72</sup> Dr. Cuthbert Gordon was given £200 in 1787 as a reward for the discovery of dyeing substances. B. T. 5: 4, 372.

<sup>73</sup> In 1792 the Committee was "alarmed" at the number of Irish emigrating to Charleston and Philadelphia. B. T. 5: 8, 102-103.

<sup>74</sup> B. T. 5: 5, 170; B. T. 5: 6, 15.

merce meet with them to determine what articles of manufacture should be taken. As the slightest disposition to trade on the part of any person belonging to the suite would disgrace the embassy in the eyes of the Chinese, only collections of samples of British and Irish manufacture were to be sent, together with presents of such articles as would be best calculated to strike the eye of the chief merchants. The principal manufacturers, especially of the finer sorts of woolen, cotton, silk, carpets, and hardware, were invited to send such samples. Some complied, though the unpopularity of the East India Company was so great that some of the merchants of Manchester, Paisley, and elsewhere refused to send through them.<sup>75</sup>

One of the most important parts of Pitt's constructive programme in the first ten years of his ministry, and probably the one he had most at heart, was that of closer relationship with Ireland. He wanted to remove the restrictions that had crippled her commerce and give her free trade with Great Britain and the colonies, while Ireland on the other hand would contribute toward the support of the British navy as a common means of defense. Unfortunately the measures that Pitt was able to carry through the British Parliament were wrecked in the Irish. But in his courageous attempt to overcome the old jealousies and animosities, he had the able assistance of the Committee.<sup>76</sup> The matter was referred to them in January, 1785, and they proceeded at once to make the most careful examination as to how far various lines of business would be affected: woolens, cottons, silks, iron and iron manufactures, corn, brewing, pottery, soap and candles, book-selling, and sugars.

The report<sup>77</sup> was printed, as was also a pamphlet<sup>78</sup> based upon it, addressed to the merchants and manufacturers of Great Britain. The latter says: "this report contains the testimonies of the most eminent of our manufacturers, and conveys, as far as it proceeds, such a fund of indisputable information as could not well be procured by any other mode."

<sup>75</sup> B. T. 5: 8; 91-96, 117-127, 199.

<sup>76</sup> Wraxall tells us that Pitt relied "principally and almost exclusively" upon Jenkinson in trying to bring about Irish commercial union, a fact that called forth the cynical comment from Fox in regard to Pitt's connection with the "King's friend". Burke declared that "the Chancellor of the Exchequer, mounted aloft on the shoulders of his right honorable friend, seems to set at defiance all argument and to despise every remonstrance. I envy not the statue its pedestal nor the pedestal its statue; one is well adapted to the other". Wraxall, *Memoirs*, IV, 125, 135; and Mr. Fox's reply to Mr. Pitt, May 31, 1785.

<sup>77</sup> *Report of the Lords of the Committee of Council*, etc. (London, 1785). Cf. Witt Bowden, "The Influence of the Manufacturers upon the Early Policies of William Pitt", in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXIX, 655-675.

<sup>78</sup> *To guard against Misrepresentation*, etc. (London, 1785).

In preparing the way for the commercial treaty with France the work of the Committee was even more lengthy and laborious. It was December 9, 1785, that the Council turned over the question of the treaty to the Committee.<sup>79</sup> The latter immediately asked for papers respecting the treaty of commerce in Queen Anne's time, for accounts of goods imported and exported from France, Flanders, Portugal, Spain, and Ireland, and for statistics regarding the number and tonnage of ships employed. It then proceeded to the examination of witnesses. Two and a half pages of indexes in the volume of minutes ending August, 1786, six in the next volume, and four volumes of the miscellaneous papers are taken up with this subject. As Pitt himself wrote: "It cannot be too generally understood that our sole object is to collect, from all parts of the kingdom, a just representation of the interests of all the various branches of trade and manufacture which can be affected by the French arrangement."<sup>80</sup>

When William Eden was chosen as the envoy extraordinary to France to negotiate the treaty, he was also appointed a member of the Committee, on the same day that the matter was referred to it. In a letter to Morton Eden, January 27, 1786, Eden said:

I write this from the Council Board, where I am at present passing every morning, and all the morning, in examinations of merchants and manufacturers upon various branches of commerce. I do not yet foresee precisely when I shall be able to proceed to the Continent; but I begin to think that it will not be possible before the first week in March, *at soonest*. It is some satisfaction, however, that our inquiries go forward pleasantly, and with much liberality and singular good-temper among the trading interests. Your old *confrère*, Sir J. Yorke, constantly lends us his presence at the Board. The others are Mr. Jenkinson, Mr. Grenville, Lord Mulgrave, Lord Carmarthen, Lord Walsingham, etc., and we sit every day in the week.<sup>81</sup>

After Eden's departure the despatches were also considered by the Committee, and their share in the treaty eventually became much more than that of a medium of information. A letter from Eden to Pitt, marked private, in July, said,

I do not know what have been Mr. Jenkinson's sentiments on all this business, but I will trouble you with the copy of a paragraph which I lately received from him . . . —"I am sorry that your business does not go on so fast as you wish. I think, however, it is wise to go on with a reasonable degree of caution: the system to be adopted is new, and there is none to which the Opposition are so likely to point their objections, if we should commit the least error."<sup>82</sup>

<sup>79</sup> B. T. 5: 2, 335.

<sup>80</sup> Auckland, *Jour. and Corr.*, I. 90.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, I. 94. In the three months from Dec. 16 to Mar. 16, Eden attended 45 meetings of the Committee.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 145.

Eden was evidently distrustful of Jenkinson, and not without reason. Both Pitt and Rayneval were anxious to introduce principles of free trade far in advance of their age and, failing that, at least to put French wines and brandies on the basis of the most favored nation; the latter alternative became the crux of the treaty. Eden had long awaited final instructions on this and other points. On July 18, 1786, his despatches to Lord Carmarthen were read to the Committee, and a draft of a despatch of Carmarthen's was read in reply and approved.<sup>83</sup> The last named states positively:

It is impossible to consent to the abolition of all prohibitory duties, as suggested by M. de Rayneval . . . but His Majesty is ready to treat for the abolition of all prohibitions and all duties which place the navigation and commerce of the subjects of France upon a more disadvantageous footing than those of any other State, except in the case of wine imported from Portugal . . . and to specify the rate of duty (which shall not be exceeded) upon some particular articles. . . . beyond this you are not authorised to engage.

These voluminous instructions were later published with Eden's letters, where it is said that they were drawn up by Jenkinson.<sup>84</sup> Thus he thwarted the plans of Pitt in regard to France as well as toward America. Having won his point, however, he was as usual zealous in putting the matter through and led the debates for the French treaty in the House of Lords. The Committee also took up the details of carrying the treaty into execution.

Pitt's failure to achieve all that he had hoped for in the French treaty did not deter him from trying to continue the work which he had begun. The papers of the Committee constitute a rather remarkable record of the attempts made to establish better commercial relations with one after another of the nations of Europe.<sup>85</sup> From 1786 to 1792 the Committee was called upon to consider the advisability of commercial treaties or conventions with Spain, Portugal, Russia, Sweden, Saxony, Austria, and Turkey, and in several instances made exhaustive reports.<sup>86</sup>

<sup>83</sup> B. T. 5:3, 413.

<sup>84</sup> Auckland, *Jour. and Corr.*, I, 146 and appendix. "Mr. Jenkinson, the chief adviser of Mr. Pitt's government, also added to Mr. Eden's embarrassments, by the very hard bargain he was determined to make with the French Government." *Ibid.*, p. 122.

<sup>85</sup> The order of the Privy Council of Aug. 9, 1786, is illustrative of the usual procedure. It directed the Committee "to take into consideration the subsisting treaties between Great Britain and the courts of Russia, Spain and Portugal, and how far it may be proper to continue, renew or alter the same." B. T. 5:3, 444.

<sup>86</sup> This was especially the case in regard to Turkey, where the trade of Egypt and the Mecca Fair was included (B. T. 6:180, 159-194); and the Austrian Netherlands, where diplomatic relations since 1495 were reviewed (B. T. 6:180,



An important study of the slave trade was also undertaken by the Committee. The report is published in a large folio volume of many pages dated March 28, 1789, and bears lasting testimony to the high character of the work. They had taken over a year for the inquiry and had got the testimony of merchants trading in Africa; of colonial agents; of governors, councils, and assemblies; of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; of ministers abroad, regarding the state of the African trade as carried on by foreign countries; and of those who had knowledge of the transportation of the slaves to the colonies and of the treatment of them there.<sup>87</sup> Of the six parts of the report the second was perhaps the most important since it dealt with slave-ships, provisions, officers, and the mortality of both slaves and seamen, in fact all the horrors of the "middle passage". Terrible brutality toward the seamen was shown and that they usually had to be forced into the service through debt or chicanery of some sort. This report was presented to the House by Pitt himself, April 25, 1789, and the evidence it contained as to the heartless cruelty of the trade furnished the foundation for the great speeches made by Wilberforce and Pitt. That of Wilberforce, May 12, 1789, "one of the ablest and most eloquent speeches of that age", was frankly based upon the report, to which he referred again and again, and in concluding moved twelve resolutions summarizing the facts given in it. The sneers of the opposition at the report brought a sharp reply from Pitt.<sup>88</sup>

Wilberforce, in April, 1791, again emphasized the chief points in the official evidence and moved for leave to bring in a bill to abolish the slave trade.<sup>89</sup> A year later when the "iron hand of unrelenting avarice", as Pitt said, refused to relinquish its hold on the lucrative trade, he made one of the greatest speeches of his life, though in a losing cause.<sup>90</sup> On the other hand, Hawkesbury once more failed to live up to a great opportunity. His position was at last assured, and he could well have faced the facts he himself had marshalled in 195-283). In view of its varied activities the following statement regarding the Committee after 1786 should be revised: "The chief business continued to be trade with America." Andrews, *Guide*, I, 103.

<sup>87</sup> The statement was made that the labor and attendance of several officers and clerks were "very much increased this year by reason of the frequent meetings of the Committee and the number of persons examined and the length of their examinations". B. T. 5: 5, p. 188.

<sup>88</sup> Tomline, *Life of Pitt*, III, 19; *Parl. Reg.*, XXXVI, 130-153; Burke called Wilberforce's speech "most masterly, impressive and eloquent". *Parl. Hist.*, XXVIII, 68.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, XXIX, 250-281.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 1133-1158.



print. Instead of that he made a trimming speech in the Lords, favoring regulation rather than abolition, since the latter would injure the commercial interests, the navigation, and the revenue of the country. Therefore, in his opinion, the Lords should consider justice as well as humanity and have some respect for charters granted and acted upon for more than a century and a half.<sup>91</sup> He could gather facts, draw up reports, and get legislation through; he could attend to a prodigious amount of business in a thoroughly businesslike way. But he had in his make-up no element of self-sacrifice, of idealism, or of far-seeing vision.

In conclusion it may be said that the Committee was organized by Pitt on a sound basis. The fact that its members were unpaid and its clerks allowed no fees kept it free from the scandal that had attached itself to the old Board of Trade. Its members were men of distinction, and the fact that many of them were leading officials of the government kept the Committee in close touch with different phases of its activities. Finally in Charles Jenkinson, successively Baron Hawkesbury and Earl of Liverpool, the Committee had a presiding officer for nearly twenty years who undoubtedly gave it the direction it was to follow as a common-sense institution devotedly zealous in the development and encouragement of British shipping, manufacture, and commerce.

ANNA LANE LINGELBACH.

<sup>91</sup> *Parl. Reg.*, XXXIII. 399.

## THE STUDY OF BRITISH FOREIGN POLICY (NINETEENTH CENTURY)<sup>1</sup>

BEFORE 1914 the scientific study of nineteenth-century British foreign policy was almost confined to a group of Cambridge historians; it was only the outbreak of war which induced many other historians to desert the Three Field System, the Manorial Court, or the King's Council and consider seriously for the first time the more recent foreign policy of their own country. A considerable period of time must elapse, however, before it is possible to ascertain the permanent effect of these conversions. The histories which the war produced are for the most part already dead—except in so far as they will always exist as evidence of the effect of war upon historical writing. The new orientation produced by the war has undoubtedly had permanent effects and this will in due season bear fruit; but at present we are in a transitional stage and all that I can attempt in this short paper is to sketch (necessarily far more dogmatically than I should like) some of the problems of the study of British diplomacy in the nineteenth century and to suggest very tentatively, since our experience is so limited, some lines along which they may be approached.

Of the importance of this study I need scarcely speak. The feverish haste with which attempts were made in 1914 to repair the omissions of the past years is proof enough of its necessity. In the stormy seas on which all countries then embarked a real history of their diplomacy of the nineteenth century might have served at least as a warning if not as a guide. But British historians at any rate had little scientific knowledge to offer to the men of action, who were left almost entirely to the tender mercies of the journalist and the sciolist.

One of the reasons for this state of affairs was no doubt the immense extent of the records with which historians of the nineteenth century were confronted. Not only were there large masses of printed documents in existence, but the unpublished records available were so large in extent as to appear a little intimidating. Even for the early years of the century they were of formidable dimensions

<sup>1</sup> A paper read at the meeting of the American Historical Association in Richmond, Dec. 29, 1924, in the section of that meeting called an Anglo-American Conference of Professors of History, in which the main theme was the question, What remains to be done, in various fields, for the history of the British Empire?

and they naturally increased as time went on.<sup>2</sup> Historians had to reckon their documents not in hundreds or thousands but in hundreds of thousands. No wonder that some were tempted to take refuge in the thought that after all the main facts were known, and that there was little of real importance to be learnt from this mass of correspondence. This view was even sustained before the Royal Commission on Public Records by no less a person than Dr. H. A. L. Fisher, and in the *English Historical Review* he went so far as to assert that "in general the harvest is first reaped by the daily paper, and it is only when the journalist has garnered his sheaves that the historian is admitted to the field for the gleanings".<sup>3</sup>

I do not think, however, that any serious historian would now support this point of view. Much of British foreign policy in the nineteenth century was, like that of other countries, conducted in secret. Though large masses of papers were laid before Parliament, their bulk increasing as the century progressed, yet these were often written as much to obscure as to reveal the real aims of the statesmen. We know now that some of the most important of recent transactions between states were entirely unknown to Parliament. At no period of the nineteenth century was it possible to avow openly all the motives and methods by which the policy of the Empire was determined.

It has, however, been asserted that the official archives do not contain the most important secrets, that only the routine correspondence has been allowed to remain there, and that the most important transactions between diplomatists are never recorded on paper. Bismarck certainly claimed and hoped that such was the case:

As for using the diplomatic reports some day as material for history, nothing of any value will be found in them . . . [he declared]. Even the despatches which do contain information are scarcely intelligible to those who do not know the people and their relations to each other. In thirty years' time who will know what sort of a man the writer himself was, how he looked at things and how his individuality affected the manner in which he presented them. . . . It is easier to find out something from the newspapers, of which, indeed, governments also make use and in which they frequently say much more clearly what they want. But that also requires a knowledge of the circumstances. The most important points, however, are always dealt with in private letters and confidential communications, also verbal ones, and these are not included in the archives.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> The despatches sent from the Foreign Office in 1818 were 5000; in 1852, 32,043 despatches were received and sent out; in 1854, 48,850. Maxwell, *Life of Clarendon*, II. 11.

<sup>3</sup> *Report of the Royal Commission on Public Records*, vol. I., pt. III. (Cd 6396), Quest. 2275. *English Historical Review*, XXVI. 810.

<sup>4</sup> Busch, *Bismarck* (Eng. ed.), I. 559.

Many of us here have seen sufficient of diplomacy to know how much truth there is in this boast—for such it was—by a grand master of the diplomatic profession.

Nevertheless Bismarck would be surprised to-day if he could know how much the official records have already revealed of even the most secret of his designs. Such records are at any rate in almost all countries a necessary foundation of the scientific study of foreign policy. For though the statesmen of the nineteenth century, like their predecessors of the eighteenth, employed many devious and subterranean methods, yet, after all, they were the centre of highly organized machines and limited by their activities. In order to carry out their plans they had to commit many of their innermost thoughts to paper, and, often without intending it, they revealed them in documents, which necessarily remained part of the public archives.

This was the case with all governments, even the most autocratic, but it was especially true of the British foreign minister, whose most secret foreign policy had throughout the century to be justified, if not to Parliament, at least to a Cabinet which always contained in it men familiar with the machinery of the office. The control was admittedly far more rigorous in some periods than in others. It varied with the personality of the foreign minister, the prime minister, and the other members of the Cabinet. Generally only a small group knew much of the most secret designs and were able to follow the details of the foreign minister's diplomacy. But always the foreign minister knew that he would be called upon to explain and justify his policy, when moments of crisis came or vigorous action was called for. However much, therefore, he might rely on private letters and intimate conversations for those tentative approaches and experiments which sometimes absorb so large a part of a foreign minister's energies, he had always to take care that his despatches and memoranda were in some sort of accord with his real ideas, however subtle or secret. Nor can these ever be understood unless the whole of his correspondence be subjected to the same scrutiny which he gave to it himself. Thus before the foreign policy of any period of the nineteenth century can be ascertained the archives of the Foreign Office must become as familiar to the historian as to the men who wrote the documents contained therein.

This task is rendered easier than it otherwise might have been by the fact that the reorganization of the Foreign Office papers in 1810 by the elder Hertslet makes them perhaps less difficult to study than those of any other great power. There is, indeed, no *catalogue raisonné* such as assists the historian at Paris; but the classification

of the papers is so simple that, except in certain miscellaneous collections, a great part of the necessary information can be obtained with a minimum of effort. This very fact has undoubtedly tended to much loose writing and thinking. The historian of the nineteenth century can often obtain results of a kind without going through the difficult training which is necessary for the study of more remote periods. He is not faced with the same difficulties of calligraphy and formulae as the student of medieval or sixteenth and seventeenth century documents. No scribes ever wrote more clearly than the aristocratic young gentlemen who copied the despatches of the foreign minister and his diplomatic agents. Canning and Palmerston exacted a high standard from their subordinates and their influence persisted until the age of the typewriter, the office printing-machine, and the telegraph. The papers are for the most part also accurately dated and their author or at least their sponsor is generally clearly attested. It is thus comparatively easy to take all the documents at their face value and with little effort produce new evidence of important historical transactions. Yet there is always much for the historian to find out about his papers, and this knowledge can only be established by applying to them a technique as rigorous and severe as that employed by historians of other periods. Much of the language of the despatches has conventional meaning which needs interpretation. Moreover the despatches were in all cases supplemented by private letters some of which did not remain in the departmental archives but of which important indications may be found in those which do exist. Some despatches were obviously written for the eyes of a foreign court, others were meant only for private perusal, while others were left to the discretion of the recipient. Others again were written specially to be printed at a later date and sometimes alleged motives and reasons which were the reverse of those which had really determined the foreign minister's instructions. In many cases it is possible to compare a despatch, which has been rendered innocuous, with the original, which contains facts or opinions which could not be avowed, and such information is often of inestimable value in determining the real motives which have determined policy.

In some cases also the drafts and minutes on which the despatch was based are in existence. Nearly all the principal foreign ministers of the nineteenth century were incredibly industrious and in the earlier part wrote or dictated nearly all their own important despatches. Yet even then many despatches and memoranda had to be submitted to the Cabinet and were altered, sometimes radically, as the result of discussions there. It is often possible to trace in the papers the

course of these discussions to which only vague references may exist elsewhere, and the evidence thus obtained is sometimes of the first importance. On the whole the secrets of the British Cabinet were as well kept as those of any other secret governing body that ever existed; and though the memoirs and private letters are now beginning to reveal a good many of them, yet the exact processes by which the most important decisions of foreign policy were arrived at are often exceedingly difficult to trace. In the drafts of the memoranda and the marginalia on the despatches which were submitted to the Cabinet there is, however, a key which may unlock many such secrets.

Moreover the influence of the permanent civil servants in London has always to be reckoned with. This was not great at the beginning of the century but increased rapidly with the progress of time. "Tenterdenism" was a well-recognized phenomenon, which in the later years had innumerable manifestations. Nothing is harder to discover and appreciate, but in the papers themselves, as the organization grows more elaborate and complete, much evidence will undoubtedly be found by those who care to look for it.

We must remember, however, that the historian has not yet access to the whole of the records of the nineteenth century. In 1914 they were available with certain important restrictions to 1860. The advance to 1878, which Mr. Austen Chamberlain announced in a recent letter, was determined some months ago by his predecessor. But though this concession is a considerable advance it is not one, I think, with which historians should remain satisfied. The principle which I have myself endeavored to persuade the Foreign Office to accept is to fix a period of years during which the archives shall remain secret, and then to allow them automatically to become public, so that each year the records of another year will become available. As Mr. Austen Chamberlain has offered to meet representative historians in conference to consider any suggestions which they may care to put before him, I hope that this point of view may be submitted to him at a suitable opportunity. It would, I venture to suggest, immensely assist the efforts which British historians are making to secure this important principle if the Council of the American Historical Association could see its way to pass some resolution on the subject.<sup>5</sup>

We can all rejoice at any rate that the Foreign Office has appointed two eminent historians, Mr. Temperley and Dr. Gooch, to

<sup>5</sup> See the resolution which was passed unanimously by the Anglo-American Conference at which this paper was read, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXX. 463.

edit a collection of documents bearing on the general European situation out of which the war arose. Their names have been received with universal satisfaction and, as Mr. Austen Chamberlain points out, "offer the best guarantee of the historical accuracy and impartiality of their work".

There is, however, much other evidence essential to the understanding of British foreign policy, which is not in the Foreign Office archives. There are in the first place the archives of the other departments of the government. These have been much less studied than those of the Foreign Office for this purpose and it is more difficult to lay down principles about them. Some of them did not exist until late in the century. With large masses of the papers contained in them the historian of foreign policy has no concern. Nevertheless there is much information about foreign affairs which never reaches or, at any rate, is in some cases never filed in the Foreign Office itself. The War Office and the Admiralty, especially the former, have always their own information and their own views on problems which especially concern them. They have connections all over the world, and, as half the most important problems of the foreign minister are concerned with defense or attack, their influence is often the determining factor in the government's decisions. The Colonial Office will furnish material of the highest importance in the later years of the century. Though the influence of the Dominions on foreign policy was not, I think, great until the twentieth century, the attitude of the Colonial Office towards the undeveloped area of the world affected the relations of Britain with every power. The Treasury and the Board of Trade grow in importance as the problems between states become more and more intimately connected with commerce and finance. Even at the beginning of the century some of the Treasury officials exercised a great influence on foreign policy, and transactions of the highest importance were negotiated by them. Much of this influence can be traced in the archives of the Foreign Office itself; but when, as often happens, the departments differ, evidence of great value may be found in other places.

Above all for the foreign policy of the Empire the papers of the Board of Control, the East India Company, and the India Office contain indispensable material. The whole policy of the Empire was possibly more influenced by the necessity of preserving its Eastern possessions than by any other single cause. There is of course much evidence of this influence in the Foreign Office papers themselves. But in many spheres and under some foreign ministers, Eastern policy was decided not in London, but in Calcutta or Delhi, and its re-



flex action on European relations is only partially revealed in the correspondence of the Foreign Office itself. Much light, I am confident, will be thrown on the whole of the foreign policy of the Empire in both hemispheres when scientific research has placed our Eastern problems in proper relation to the whole. Fortunately the work has already been begun by able writers and we can at least realize its possibilities.

Lastly there are the records of the sovereign's own correspondence, of which for part of the reign of Victoria we have been enabled to get so comprehensive a survey, with more soon to follow. The fact that few monarchs had private lives so blameless has doubtless deprived us of earlier records. It is unlikely that in our time those of her successor will be available to the same extent or will give the same information on foreign affairs.

All these may be considered as public papers. But though the information which they contain is of primary importance, it is true, as Bismarck insisted, that there are essential things omitted for which we must look elsewhere. Much is of course contained in the muniment rooms of the descendants of the diplomatists of the nineteenth century. The distinction between private and public property in Foreign Office papers was always a loose one, and it does not appear to have grown more distinct as the century went on. Delicate negotiations were always discussed mainly in private letters; but these were often formal in tone and were merely kept out of the office series for reasons of convenience. They were often turned into official despatches at a later date. But, where there was a degree of intimacy between the foreign minister and his subordinates, important transactions were often conducted through the medium of private letters, which were considered as the private property of the parties concerned. Occasionally they were left in the archives, but more frequently they were removed. Indeed the diplomatists often also removed public documents to which they had no title. For these documents, therefore, we have to rely on the good-will of their descendants and are at the mercy of family pride and caprice. These important papers were often edited by relations and friends, especially in the earlier years by clerical friends, who had no knowledge of the important events which they illuminate and who were merely concerned with biography and not with history. While we have had one or two great biographies, we are behind America in editions of "Writings" of important statesmen, though it may be hoped that the recent welcome excursion of the Historical Manuscripts Commission into the nineteenth century, which has given us the important *Bath-*



*urst Papers*, will only be the first of a long series of such publications.

Some of the most important evidence of British foreign policy is, however, not to be found in Britain. It lies in the archives of the foreign offices of other countries. The reports of the foreign ambassadors and ministers in London are indispensable to the understanding of the British records. Much of the most important business between states is arranged by conversations between the foreign minister and the diplomatic circle. If a result is achieved, the notes subsequently exchanged can often only be understood if the preliminary negotiations are also known, while if the negotiation fails there is sometimes no trace of it left in London. It is true that a foreign minister is accustomed to make a note of an important conversation with an ambassador or minister and file it in the archives. But this procedure was not customary until late in the century, and in any case every *tête-à-tête* conversation has two sides to it.

Moreover in the reports of the foreign ambassadors there is much about those very points on which it is so difficult to obtain information from the papers in London. A good ambassador establishes relations not only with the foreign minister, but with other important members of the Cabinet and high officials, and it is his business to ascertain the contribution of each to the foreign policy of the country. He must moreover study public opinion closely and report to his government how it reacts towards the various problems with which he is dealing. He establishes close relations with the press and in some periods even exercises by one means or another considerable influence upon it. Indeed for the whole of our history, domestic and economic as well as diplomatic, his reports are sources of the highest value.

This fact has been long recognized as regards other centuries. The state has even paid for the publication of such reports, so high has their value been reckoned. But they have been strangely neglected for the nineteenth century, though some archives have been open to a comparatively late date for a considerable period of time. We have no such guides on the materials of British history in foreign archives as have been made for American history. Now that the attention of our students has been directed towards them we may hope for results which will profoundly affect our judgments on our foreign policy, which has been hitherto written almost exclusively from British sources, so far as unpublished evidence is concerned.

Lastly there is the important problem of the press. Even in 1815 all the governments of the Great Powers had press bureaus of one kind or another and had begun to exert official pressure on the news-

papers and to provide the public with official news, especially in foreign affairs. The British press was for the most part independent, though even then there was a subsidized newspaper and Treasury funds for influencing others. Some newspapers came into existence in order to be bought by foreign powers. There had already begun, therefore, that mysterious and important connection between the press and foreign policy which has played so important a part in the diplomacy of the nineteenth century. In Britain it was mainly exercised not by the cruder methods of bribery but by the influence of important statesmen on this newspaper or that. Some of this influence has been revealed by the diaries and correspondence of the men concerned, but there is yet much to be found out. The subject was one with which the diplomatic circle was always largely preoccupied and they discovered many of its secrets. Their own attempts to influence the British press, not always unsuccessful, are also revealed in their despatches and the knowledge is of the utmost importance in judging the reaction of public opinion towards any problem of nineteenth-century diplomacy.

In any case the press played a great part in determining the course of public policy as soon as the parliamentary control was fully established. It had its own sources of information, which were sometimes more accurate than those of the Foreign Office itself, and the course of foreign policy can not be successfully described without taking into account this all-pervading influence. Some suggestive studies made on both sides of the Atlantic have already revealed the great opportunities for scientific research in this field.

Such, in brief outline, are some of the methods by which a history of the foreign policy of the Empire in the nineteenth century may be written. I have little time to consider how much has already been accomplished. It may perhaps be said that for the period 1815-1830 the Foreign Office records in the Record Office have been practically all read and an attempt made to survey them as a whole and most of the correspondence of the foreign ambassadors and ministers is known in one shape or another; for the period 1830-1848 some important work has been done, but in more piecemeal fashion and with little reference to unpublished foreign sources; for the period 1848-1860 the British records have been used more for the elucidation of the foreign policy of other countries than for that of Britain; while for the later period, though several historians have seen some of the papers, it can scarcely be claimed that they have yet been seriously studied. For the most part, therefore, the work has still to be done and furnishes those interested in the subject with an ample field for

research in which many important discoveries may well be made. The student is now provided by the *Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy* and other works with a background and a bibliography, which makes many of his problems far easier than they were before the war. The large quantity of information which is coming from the archives of the defeated countries provides him also with easily accessible controls of the highest importance right down to the end of the period. We may hope then that if historical science makes the same progress in the next twenty years as it has made in the twenty years just elapsed, this important work will be by then far advanced. There will indeed be some things still hidden; but the total mass of evidence is so great that, if it be scientifically studied, we ought to be able to divine that which we can not see. The mathematicians tell us that in the heavens there are numerous dark stars without light and heat, yet the industry and imagination of the scientist has been able to determine their mass and chart their course. If we can only show similar energy, organization, and patience even the most secret aims and methods of the diplomatists can be discovered and the whole scheme of foreign policy be placed in its proper perspective. Then, perhaps, we can pass with more authority from revelation to judgment.

C. K. WEBSTER.

## PLANTATIONS WITH SLAVE LABOR AND FREE<sup>1</sup>

It has been my fortune within recent months to visit an establishment comprising nine thousand acres of delta land in cultivation. The great levees which guard it from flood border not the Mississippi but the Sacramento and Mokelumne rivers. A hoe-gang in which I counted thirty-nine laborers, working straight abreast, each upon a furrow a measured mile in length, comprised not negroes, but Hindus, Sicilians, Mexicans, and men of yet other stocks. The crop was not sugar-cane, rice, or cotton, but sugar-beets. The place is called a ranch, not a plantation—but that is the fashion in California.

The laborers whether at hoe or plough included no women or children (this was not a Japanese enterprise!). There were no cottages, except those of the foremen, whether clustered at ranch headquarters or scattered about the fields, but bunk-houses instead. Until two years ago many of the laborers had families on the place; but the management, finding that women made for strife, changed the régime to the present stag basis. Wages of ploughmen are \$3.50 per day and board, which is reckoned to cost \$1.50 additional. The hoeing and harvest are not financed directly by the ranch management but are let to Italian contractors at \$50 per acre for the season; and the contractors employ, feed, and bunk their own hands, paying them such wages as the market may require. Harvest comprises merely the pulling, topping, and loading of the beets, since the ranch does not convert its crop into sugar. The hoe-hands depart at the season's end; some of the ploughmen remain.<sup>2</sup>

Apart from the families of the manager and foremen, and except for the cooks and "matrons" of the bunk-houses, the ranch is a womanless world. As such it would seem to be fairly representative of California large-scale farming, if the hundreds of migratory laborers whom the tourist encounters are an index—weather-beaten men with bedding-rolls over their shoulders, trudging the highways or the railroad tracks, shifting from fields to vineyards, from orange and lemon groves to walnuts and olives, from plums and peaches to prunes and pears, almost literally from figs to thistles, since burr

<sup>1</sup> An address delivered before the Agricultural History Society at Richmond, Dec. 27, 1924.

<sup>2</sup> Alfalfa, asparagus (eight hundred acres in this), and fruits are minor crops on the ranch. Virtually nothing consumed by the personnel on the place is produced upon it. Even the butter is brought each week from San Francisco.

artichokes are but the unblown blossoms of highly educated thistle plants!

In the region of Kansas and Colorado, likewise, there are huge tracts devoted to sugar-beets and other crops, owned by corporations and cultivated in large part by a shifting personnel. Along both flanks of the Rocky Mountains, furthermore, every "dirt farmer" seeds many more acres in small grain than he can hope to harvest alone. The migratory laborers move from the San Joaquin to the Kootenay or from the Red River of the South to its namesake of the North on a schedule of the ripening wheat. Widely in the West, and considerably indeed in more easterly regions, the farmers and their families do by no means all the work of their farm, but depend essentially upon employees in considerable volume.

In all the foregoing there are suggestions of the plantation system. Sugar-beets among Western crops invite the closest approach to the classic plantation type, essentially because they require continuous cultivation through a fairly long growing season, and they must be worked with hoe as well as plough. The cultivation, indeed, is much like that of cotton, for the seed are drilled thickly in the furrow, the seedlings are thinned by chopping, and the plants which remain are set too closely to permit of cross-ploughing. In other respects the Western régime is in sharp contrast to that of the South, whether past or present—most notably in its heavy turnover of labor and its lack of domesticity.

The slave-plantation régime owed its origins, curiously, to conditions in which negroes figured little. In the Spanish West Indies, on the one hand, the first agglomerations of labor were of conscripted aborigines; and in early Virginia they were of white indentured servants. In either case the degree of domesticity was presumably small, and the turnover was rather large; for the coerced Indians died with disconcerting speed, and the indentured whites went their several ways when their terms expired—if haply they did not die or escape in advance. It was in large part to diminish this turnover that recourse was had to Guinea, a country discovered half a century before America, whose deported natives had promptly been adjudged in Europe "very loyal and obedient servants, without malice", who "never more tried to fly, but rather in time forgot all about their own country".<sup>3</sup> Their sturdiness of physique and their amiability of temper led eventually to the replacement of virtually all other sorts of massed labor by negroes wherever the work was of simple routine character, and to the development of slavery as a

<sup>3</sup> Azurara, in *Hakluyt Society Publications*, XCV. 85.

scheme for their industrial and social control. Thus in the production of tobacco, rice, cotton, and cane-sugar negro slave labor came to have no rival except that of white yeomen upon their own small farms.

By this recourse to negroes in slavery, the turnover was almost wholly eliminated except as involved in the flight, the sale, or the death of slaves, and the death or bankruptcy of masters. From year to year overseers, where there were such, constituted as a rule the only changing personnel on the plantations. Now this absence of turnover, this lifetime adjustment, this permanent proprietorship of labor, created problems, conditions, and an atmosphere of its own. In the first place it made labor inelastic. The same force must be fed, clothed, and sheltered the year round, and must be kept from unproductive idleness. Even when slaves were hired, the standard unit was a year's service. This meant an inescapable problem of flattening the peaks and filling the troughs in the curve of the labor demand. A planter's maxim was: "The ways of industry are constant and regular, not to be in a hurry at one time and do nothing at another, but to be always usefully and steadily employed."<sup>4</sup> The solution was easy in the West Indies, where the tropical climate gave leeway at all seasons. In continental crops, peaks were inevitable, particularly in the sugar-cane harvest to escape frost, in the transplanting of tobacco, and in the picking of cotton.<sup>5</sup> The contemplation of these peaks

<sup>4</sup> "Plantation and Frontier Documents", ed. U. B. Phillips, in *Documentary History of American Industrial Society*, I. 109.

<sup>5</sup> In the eight or ten weeks of the "grinding season" in Louisiana the peak was so pronounced that overtime work, on Sundays in the field and both at night and on Sundays in the mill, was of common recourse. In the other staples overtime was quite unusual. The following illustrative items are from the diary of William Bolling of Bolling Hall, Goochland County, Virginia, the manuscript of which for 1827 and 1828 is on deposit with the Virginia Historical Society. The special occasion in each instance was the occurrence of rain—for wet ground was required for transplanting the tobacco seedlings and moist air was essential for striking and prizing (i.e., packing) the cured crop.

1828, Apr. 5. "Striking tob'o finished about 1 o'clock this morning. Rain commenced last ev'g, which bro't it rapidly in order. I had a supper cook'd for my people, sent them whiskey and a lanthorn with candles to the prize house,—and thus we have struck our whole crop in the last three days from one season [i.e., rain], which was very favourable."

1828, June 9, a rainy Sunday. "My people all engaged in planting tob'o, a thing I rarely do [i.e., Sunday work], but compelled on this occasion by the scarcity of plants, not to miss an opportunity so late in the season."

1828, July 5, Saturday. "Gave my people here a holiday in compensation for their work in planting tob'o on Sunday last."

For the wheat harvest in Virginia, extra hands were procured on hire. Examples of this are in Bolling's diary under dates of June 13, June 15, and July

controlled the planning for the year. Just so much land was assigned to the staple as it was reckoned the force could cover at peak tasks. The troughs were slight in cotton and sugar-cane, for the planters' adage that these crops required thirteen months in the year had considerable substance. It meant, of course, that preparation for a new crop ought to begin before the old harvest was done and that the work when once begun was fairly continuous. Periods "out of crop" as regards the staple were filled in part by auxiliary crops, notably Indian corn, and in part by the clearing of new grounds, the cutting and hauling of fuel, and varied jobs of renovation.

Furthermore every parcel of slaves comprised some who at some periods or at all times were not fit for field work or were too valuable to be employed therein. Blacksmithing, shoemaking, spinning, weaving, nursing, as well as domestic service, were available for these, in furtherance of the policy of making each plantation self-sufficient in every expedient regard.

Segregation was accepted as necessary, and self-containment was promoted as highly desirable. Matings among the slaves were encouraged within the plantation group, though not strictly confined within its limits. The planter expected his future laborers in the main to be born, reared, and trained on the place. His obvious method was to promote family life among the slaves, and to insure the care of children. Here his wife had special functions. The master's household gave lessons to the slaves, whether by precept or example, and the play-time intermingling of white and black children contributed a positive link of domestic interrelation. The plantation was not merely a seat of industry, but was permanently and potently a homestead.

There was perpetual need of adjustment and readjustment, conciliation, stimulus, and control. Negro slave labor tended to be slothful, because the negroes were slaves, and also because the slaves were negroes, imperfectly habituated to a civilized régime. Various devices by way of appeal, reward, or other inducement were utilized in efforts to increase the zeal, energy, and initiative of the laborers;

7, 1828, and in "The Westover Journal of John A. Selden" (printed in the *Smith College Studies in History*, vol. VI., no. 4) under dates of July 21, Aug. 11, and Aug. 19, 1858, June 30 and July 22, 1859, and July 20, 1861. After his wheat harvest of 1859 Selden gave his slaves a holiday; but needing some work done, he hired five of them, at seventy-five cents each, to glean and plough that day (entries of July 2 and 3, 1859). Westover was typical of tidewater Virginia plantations in this period in producing no tobacco, but using wheat as its chief crop.



but achievement by the planter was always limited by the quality of the children whom his women chanced to bear, by the inertia implied in slave status, and by any deficit in the vigor and finesse of the management. The greater the scale of a plantation and the greater the variety of its undertakings, the greater was the task of administration. The sagacious overseer of a great plantation reported to his employer in 1827: "I killed twenty-eight head of beef for the people's Christmas dinner. I can do more with them in this way than if all the hides of the cattle were made into lashes." And again in the following year: "You justly observe that if punishment is in one hand, reward should be in the other."<sup>6</sup> The ideal in slave control may perhaps be symbolized by an iron hand in a velvet glove. Sometimes the velvet was lacking, but sometimes the iron. Failure was not far to seek in either case.

Upon prosperous plantations there was wide variety in the details of regulation, with definite system the tendency on large units but with blurred schedules on the small. This may be illustrated from a parcel of six affidavits made by as many Georgia planters in 1853, whose slaves ranged in number from as many as 450 to as few as 16.<sup>7</sup> The six coincided as regards hours of work by the slaves (from dawn to sunset, with some two hours of rest at noon). They substantially agreed also as to the issue of clothing (two outfits each year) and as to the age (ten or twelve years) at which young slaves began field work. The five largest plantations allowed child-bearing women a month as a minimum of leisure after confinement: upon this the sixth did not report. The four largest had schedules for mothers to leave the field to suckle their children; but the owner of forty gave his women full discretion and "free permission to leave their work for this purpose". Here again the owner of sixteen was silent. The largest proprietor had a yearly contract with a physician providing for twice-a-week visits at a minimum. The owner of 150 also reported a contract with a physician, but did not specify any visiting schedule. As to children he wrote: "I think we have lost one child in every four during sickness—caused generally by carelessness of the mothers. Since the adoption of my plan of a

<sup>6</sup> Frances Butler Leigh, *Ten Years on a Georgia Plantation* (London, 1883), p. 233.

<sup>7</sup> These affidavits, which were made in response to a questionnaire issued by Judge Ebenezer Starnes of the Georgia superior court, in pursuit of an inquiry which was mainly concerned with questions of criminality, are printed in *The Slaveholder Abroad . . . A series of letters from Dr. Pleasant Jones to Major Joseph Jones, of Georgia* (Philadelphia, 1860), pp. 492-504. Mr. Leonard L. Mackall of Savannah has ascertained that Judge Starnes was himself the author of this book.

nursery, few die after being weaned, compared to what died formerly, probably not more than one a year on the average—one or two." All reported, with statistics, very large proportions of children in the numbers of their slaves; and the owner of sixty-five said as to births: "In connection with this subject, I may remark that eleven years after the death of my father, the slaves that I inherited from him had more than doubled."

The fifth one of these documents is perhaps the most interesting of the group. It reads in part:

I have sixteen negro slaves—five males that are field-hands, and three women—two of them child-bearing, the other aged; and there are eight children, under ten years old. We give them as much food as they want and can eat, treating them as the white family in this respect—their food being prepared for them by the same cook which prepares the meals for the family. . . . I cannot give the quantity in pounds, for we don't allowance.

This was in contrast with the practice of the other five planters, each of whom had a fairly definite schedule of rations. The owner of sixteen continued, as to children: "When they are not under the care of the mother, they are taken to the yard, and cared for by the cook." And as to medical service: "I have never needed a physician for my negroes—indeed, I never needed a physician for my whites until last fall. I would send for a physician for my slaves under the same circumstances as for my white family."

It is regrettable that data descriptive of small plantations and farms are very scant. Such documents as exist point unmistakably to informality of control and intimacy of white and black personnel on such units. This is highly important in its bearing upon race relations, for according to the census of 1860, for example, one-fourth of all the slaves in the United States were held in parcels of less than ten slaves each, and nearly another fourth in parcels of ten to twenty slaves.<sup>8</sup> This means that about one-half of the slaves had a distinct facilitation in obtaining an appreciable share in the social heritage of their masters. *Per contra*, it should be observed that the small proprietors were not generally of the most cultured class of society. The larger planters were as a rule the better educated, nicer in speech, more polished in manner, more urbane and refined. While their domestic servants in many cases possessed and notably improved an opportunity for procuring gentle breeding, the crowds of field negroes were left very much to their own crude devices in

<sup>8</sup> *Eighth Census*, III. 247. The statistics for Arkansas in this table are obviously wrong; the true numbers for that commonwealth may be found on p. 224. On p. 248 of the same volume is a table of slaveholdings in 1850.

a cultural sense. Nevertheless, the very fact that the negroes were slaves linked them as a whole more closely to the whites than any scheme of wage-labor could well have done.

Lifelong adjustment and the prospect of it brought habituation and accommodation. John Randolph, it is true, wrote in 1814: "My plantation affairs, always irksome, are now revolting".<sup>9</sup> and Thomas Ruffin wrote of his wife: "she has been unable to reconcile herself to the particular place we are at or to vocations that unavoidably engage the attention of the master and mistress of slaves on a large plantation."<sup>10</sup> The careers and predilections of these two had made them devoid of the traits necessary and standard in plantation life: the faculty of unruffled response to the multitudinous calls of slaves upon the attention, and the tolerance of slack service. The roses, real or fancied, in the planter's bed made most folk ignore the thorns. A keen observer said with little exaggeration: "A plantation well stocked with hands is the *ne plus ultra* of every man's ambition who resides at the south."<sup>11</sup> The planters themselves, as a rule, relished and even exalted their calling. As one of them put it, with a bit of bombast: "Planting . . . in this country is the only independent and really honorable occupation. . . . The planters here are essentially what the nobility are in other countries."<sup>12</sup> Now this exaltation was greatly to the advantage of the slaves. The grandiloquence was based upon genuine self-respect, of which an essential ingredient is respect for others. Severity, even brutality, was not absent from the régime; but the "lords of the lash", while depending upon the lash in last resort, were certainly among "the mildest mannered men that ever scuttled ship or cut a throat".

To speak more soberly, the consciousness of power, together with a sense of gentility, promoted toleration and self-restraint. This was well discussed by the writer of an essay packed with sagacious analysis in the *American Quarterly Review*, in 1827, who is regretably anonymous. He said:

The high sense of personal dignity with which the habit of authority and command inspires him [the slaveholder], makes him courteous in his man-

<sup>9</sup> H. A. Garland, *Life of John Randolph*, II. 42, quoted in Gamaliel Bradford, *Damaged Souls*, p. 140. The sentence which follows in Randolph's letter, which Bradford fails to quote, blunts the point of this indictment: "I have lost three-fourths of the finest and largest crop I ever had."

<sup>10</sup> *Papers of Thomas Ruffin*, ed. Hamilton (North Carolina Historical Commission), II. 153.

<sup>11</sup> [J. H. Ingraham], *The South-west* (New York, 1835), II. 84.

<sup>12</sup> James H. Hammond, quoted by Elizabeth Merritt, in *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, XLI. 377.

ners, liberal in his sentiments, generous in his actions. But, with his disdain of all that is coarse, and little, and mean, there often mingle the failings of a too sensitive pride; jealousy of all superiority; impatience of contradiction; quick and violent resentment. His liability to these vices is so obvious, that it is often an especial purpose of early instruction to guard against them; and thus is formed in happy natures, such a habit of self-command and virtuous discipline, as to make them remarkable for their mildness and moderation. . . . Mr. Jefferson, who has given so lively a description of the effects of slavery on the temper of the slaveholder, and whose views are so just in the general, was himself a remarkable exception to the unamiable picture which he has drawn.<sup>13</sup>

Plantation industry was the "big business" of colonial and ante-bellum times. It had a certain rigidity of regimentation due to the racial factor and to the slave status of the laborers. But as a rule it was free from the absenteeism of proprietorship and the consequent impersonality which regrettably prevail in the modern factory régime. The plantation system was not essentially static. Surely not in a territorial sense. Small-scale pioneers made the first clearings in the wilderness, but the planters followed close on their heels and consolidated the gains. A proof of their quickness and thoroughness in exploiting their opportunity lies in the population map of the United States, of even the present time. Everywhere east of Texas the best cotton districts are peopled by a majority of negroes to-day, because within the space of threescore years and seven from the invention of the gin, planters had carried slaves in predominant numbers to all these districts and had maintained market inducements causing slave-traders to supplement the effects of their own migration. In the same period they placed the American cotton belt in an unchallenged primacy in the world's production of the staple. Texas was marked as the one remaining province of prospective conquest. A planter migrating thither in 1846 remarked to a fellow-traveller "that he had been eaten out of Alabama by his negroes".<sup>14</sup> Competition was very keen among the planters, and the very scale of their concerns made them the more sensitive to the need of moving. And yet a multitude avoided the necessity.

It has been charged repeatedly by writers whose opinions are in general worthy of respect that the plantation system devoured the soil, while the farming system did not. This may frankly be challenged. The lands of the South, which of course were nowhere glaciated, fall into three main classes: that of virtually no soil, that of shallow soil, and that of deep soil. The first comprises large tracts

<sup>13</sup> *American Quarterly Review*, II. 251-252.

<sup>14</sup> Sir Charles Lyell, *Second Visit to the United States*, second ed. (London, 1850), II. 109.

in the coastal plain so sandy as to support no indigenous vegetation but pine-trees and wire-grass. The second consists mainly of the piedmont, where the clay, though lean in plant-food, supported hardwood forests, which in turn overlaid the land with a thin stratum of leaf-mold. The third comprised alluvial strips (notably the "Mississippi bottoms") and scattered limestone tracts and loess areas. Now no one who could pay any price for farm-land would dally with the pine-barrens before the introduction of commercial fertilizers. Certainly the planters avoided them with one accord. At the other extreme, the alluvial tracts were occupied by planters from the beginning, with little participation by farmers—partly because the problem of flood-control put a premium upon large-scale undertakings. It was only in the region of shallow soil that sharp competition between the types occurred. This was entered upon by planters and farmers alike, eager to exploit such resources as it offered. Its limited supply of plant-food might possibly be husbanded for a time by rotation of crops; but where the surface was sloping, as nearly everywhere it was, the run-off of the heavy Southern rains quickly washed the surface away except where the rush of water was checked by special devices—horizontal furrows, hillside ditches, and grass-balks which by catching the flow gradually terraced the hills. When once the leaf-mold was gone, which was but a question of time, there was a deficit of humus to hold moisture against times of drought. The absence of deep frost in winter meant a lack of loosening by thaw in spring. In short, while the climate was good for cotton, the soil was not long very good for anything.

Now, so long as population was sparse and in consequence land was "dirt cheap", shallow soil was regarded, though regretfully, as a consumable commodity. Under economic circumstances but one remove from frontier conditions, the sacrifice of the forests was little less inevitable than the exhaustion of the soil which the forests had made. In earning a livelihood planters and farmers were in competition, each growing cotton to the top of his bent and each tempted to sell his soil in the form of lint and then move on whither fresh forests might be felled.<sup>15</sup> Statistical evidence is available that the planters resisted this temptation distinctly more than did the farmers. In Oglethorpe County, for example, which is typical of the Georgia

<sup>15</sup> The same conditions prevailed, of course, in the tobacco zone. A citizen of Halifax County, Virginia, wrote in 1835: "The spirit of emigration here is entirely at war with the spirit of improvement. Men constantly say, 'Why improve? I am going in a short time to the West.' Others again, 'My land will support me as long as I live, and my children will, as soon as they are of age, go out.'" *Farmers' Register*, III, 508.

piedmont, the white population was nearly stationary from 1800 to 1820 at something less than 7000 souls. Thereafter it steadily declined to 4000 in 1860. The slaves, however, increased from 3000 in 1800 to 7000 in 1820, and slightly increased thereafter—or, in the course of sixty years 4000 slaves replaced 3000 whites. The slaveholding families increased from 520 in 1800 to 760 in 1810, maintained their number for the following decade, then declined to 540 in 1860, while the scale of average slaveholding was more than doubling in size and the scale of the largest unit in slaveholding was quadrupling. The number of non-slaveholding white families declined continuously from some 800 in the year 1800 to little more than 200 in 1860.<sup>16</sup> That is to say, when the land was fresh at the beginning of the century, and the cotton industry was an infant, the farmers were in fairly full possession; but the planters were already coming in with a rush which continued for two decades and filled the county to its fullest for the whole ante-bellum period. Prodded by planters from the eastward who offered to buy their farms, and lured by the free, fresh lands of the West, the farmers, in homely phrase, cleared, cropped, and cleared out. After 1820 an occasional planter also sold and moved, but the bulk of them stayed and enlarged their holdings of both land and slaves.

In the stress of competition every man in such a region of shallow soil faced an alternative of moving or improving. The farmers most copiously moved;<sup>17</sup> the planters more commonly improved. Among them were the first to resort to horizontal ploughing, the first also to buy guano and other fertilizers to replenish the plant-food in their soil, and the most active in seed selection and in experimenting with new crops.<sup>18</sup> All this was no more than was to have been expected; for the planters had leisure, which the farmers had not, and by reason of their scale the planters had prospect of richer profits

<sup>16</sup> For fuller data and discussion, see U. B. Phillips, "The Origin and Growth of the Southern Black Belts", in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XI. 810-813.

<sup>17</sup> This process was not without contemporary comment. In 1838, for example, R. B. Buckner wrote concerning his neighborhood in Fauquier County, Va.: "The farms . . . are generally rather large, with a strong, but very natural tendency to accumulation in the hands of the few, to the exclusion of the many. 'The rich are becoming richer', but the poor, not being willing to become poorer, are going where they can 'get richer' too—they are going to 'the great West'." *Farmers' Register*, VI. 458.

<sup>18</sup> A Virginian who signed himself "Conservator" did not exaggerate greatly when he wrote in 1836: "Wealth is not always (nor indeed often) accompanied by education, intelligence and public spirit—nor does poverty always banish these qualities and their valuable effects. But yet no one can deny that every benefit from these sources that has served to improve the state of agriculture, has been owing to the occupiers of large farms." *Farmers' Register*, IV. 366.

from any successful innovation. What was not to be expected is that latter-day students should fail to see the probabilities and actualities in the case.

When the small remainder of the suitable climatic zone had come to be occupied—dealing now with the prospect in 1860—opportunity for enhancing fortune by migration must have dwindled, and pressure to improve methods must have increased upon all the population. This need not have brought a decline of the plantation system, though it would impinge upon the régime of slavery. Already in the 'fifties planters far and wide were employing Irish gangs to dig their ditches, build their levees, and perform other tasks involving exposure or strain.<sup>19</sup> They were embracing a new means to cherish the lives, health, strength, and good-will of their precious slaves. In addition they were seeking increasingly to raise the level and broaden the scope of slave capacity and to find special openings for such of their slaves as developed special aptitudes. The economic problem as regards personnel put emphasis of course upon rewards as well as upon opportunities for skilled work by slaves, and this suggested the relaxation of the restraints of slavery. That more was not accomplished in this line was due in part to the abolition agitation, the repercussion of which in the South put reactionary emphasis upon the race problem and police.

The interesting and not wholly hideous career of the slave-plantation system was cut short by revolution imposed by force from without. Abolition was followed by reconstruction—not merely the radical rule known to political historians, but simultaneously a home-grown industrial reorganization, achieved painfully and piecemeal.

Many folk of the old régime were destroyed by the war—not merely soldiers on the battle-field, but civilians white and black, driven or lured from shelter, sustenance, and sanitation. Slaves died by uncounted thousands, and many of their masters were utterly broken. The case of Thomas Hamilton Cooper of "Hopeton" on the Altamaha River is an example. Sir Charles Lyell, recognizing him as a distinguished fellow-naturalist, paid him a long visit in 1846 and made laudatory notes upon the library, the household, and the plantation with its five hundred slaves.<sup>20</sup> Another pen has left an account of his burial in 1866, after his death in poverty and despair:

The steps of the church were broken down, so we had to walk up a plank to get in; the roof was fallen in, so that the sun streamed down on our

<sup>19</sup> Cf. U. B. Phillips, *American Negro Slavery* (New York, 1918), pp. 301-302.

<sup>20</sup> Sir Charles Lyell, *Second Visit to the United States*, I. 328-363.



heads; while the seats were all cut up and marked with the names of Northern soldiers, who had been quartered there during the war. . . . The funeral party arrived. The coffin was in a cart drawn by one miserable horse, and was followed by the Cooper family on foot, having come this way from the landing, two miles off. From the cart to the grave the coffin was carried by four old family negroes, faithful to the end.<sup>21</sup>

The survivors of the cataclysm had to solve the problem of economic life afresh under conditions of general derangement and almost universal poverty. The landholders possessed land and managerial experience—and worthless Confederate currency. The freedmen had liberty, and little else but a residual acquiescence in the necessity of working for a living.

Crop-sharing was adopted in some quarters of the cotton belt as early as 1865, and crop liens came quickly after—the one to relink labor with land and management in the absence of money, the other to link all these to banks or merchants when credit was imperative but land so cheap that mortgageable values were inadequate. The lien laid fresh emphasis upon the staple crop; and crop-sharing tended to stereotype schedules in order to diminish the points of possible friction between the two parties to each contract. Tenancy at fixed rentals also attained considerable vogue; but this promoted soil exhaustion by divorcing the temporary interest of the tenant from the permanent interest of the proprietor.<sup>22</sup> In any case the cluster of cabins near the landowner's dwelling was generally abandoned, and isolated houses instead were scattered over the land.<sup>23</sup> The freedmen had fairly copious opportunity to procure farms of their own, as may be gathered from the fact, for example, that as late as the census of 1900 the average value of farm-land throughout the state of Mississippi was reckoned at \$6.30 per acre, as compared with sevenfold that sum in Illinois. But improvidence was so ingrained in the field negroes that the development along this line was far less than might otherwise have been expected.

As an example of plantations operated on the crop-sharing basis, the system and experience on "Dunleith", which lies in the Yazoo-Mississippi delta, have been so clearly and cogently set forth by its owner, Mr. Alfred H. Stone, in a book so widely known,<sup>24</sup> that I need not discuss this type in detail. Suffice it to say that under the

<sup>21</sup> Frances B. Leigh, *Ten Years on a Georgia Plantation*, pp. 46-47.

<sup>22</sup> E. M. Banks, "The Economics of Land Tenure in Georgia", in *Columbia University Studies*, vol. XXIII, no. 1; R. P. Brooks, "The Agrarian Revolution in Georgia", in *University of Wisconsin Bulletin, History Series*, vol. III, no. 3.

<sup>23</sup> D. C. Barrow, "A Georgia Plantation", in *Scribner's Monthly*, XXI, 830-836 (April, 1881).

<sup>24</sup> A. H. Stone, *Studies in the American Race Problem* (New York, 1908).

most effective management crop-sharing implies nearly as full supervision as does wage-labor.<sup>25</sup>

Among wage-labor plantations in the cotton belt the most notable has been that of James M. Smith in Oglethorpe County, Georgia, where the land, as has been noted above, was considerably depleted before his day. Mr. Smith began as a youth in 1866 with a one-horse farm. Undaunted by crop failure from drought in his first year, he persevered so thriftily and prospered so largely that by 1904 he had accumulated some 23,000 acres of land, from which he was deriving an income of about \$100,000 a year.<sup>26</sup> At this time he had scores of convicts on lease from the state of Georgia and hundreds of laborers on wages, many of them bound by voluntary indenture for terms as long as five years. His contracts with these provided, on locally printed forms, that he was to furnish board, lodging, clothes, and washing, to pay wages of stipulated amount on a specified day of each year, and to teach the apprentice a specified trade, usually that of farming. The laborer, on his part, bound himself to work faithfully, to "respect and obey all orders and commands with respect to the business" and "demean" himself "orderly and soberly" for the full term of the contract, and to account for all loss of time except in case of temporary sickness continuing not longer than six days at any one time. This contemplated a bunk-house basis for a stag personnel. Doubtless there were contracts of other sorts for the numerous laborers who had families. As to the specifications of these I failed to take note when on a visit to the plantation twenty years ago, perhaps because I was diverted by the phenomena of a convict camp, the huge barns, the stalwart mules, the many handicrafts, the model dairy, the plantation railroad, the cotton-seed oil mill, the corps of boy messengers on the planter's piazza steps at Smithonia, and the crops which were far more flourishing than was common in that quarter of the state. The Smithonia establishment had so many peculiar features as to make it rather a demonstration of what might conceivably be done than an example of what was at all commonly accomplished in the piedmont cotton zone. In cotton culture, and in tobacco likewise, tenancy in some form was by far the most common recourse.

In Carolina rice and Louisiana sugar, on the other hand, large-scale industry under unit control was well-nigh imperative; and this led to wage-labor as almost the sole reliance from immediately after the abolition of slavery. Plantations were reorganized intact, and the negro cabins remained clustered. Pay-rolls were instituted,

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Carl Kelsey, *The Negro Farmer* (Chicago, 1903).

<sup>26</sup> Harry Hodgson, in *World's Work*, IX, 5723-5733 (January, 1905).

overseers were styled managers, and drivers were rechristened captains for greater dignity. Strikes were not unknown; but gang or task work was the normal order of the day, and efficient routine the key to success. The financial risk was concentrated upon the planters, whom vicissitudes or ineptitude occasionally bankrupted; but new entrepreneurs generally appeared to replace those who failed, except in the rice industry, which by force of competition from Louisiana and Texas has dwindled almost to the vanishing point in its old habitat.

The sugar régime may be illustrated from the diary of work on Corinne Plantation, lying just below New Orleans, for the year 1876.<sup>27</sup> The milling of the crop of the preceding year continued to the middle of January. Then, while for a short time a gang of Irishmen were levelling certain fields on special contract, negroes began ploughing, with two men and four mules to each of eight ploughs for the heavy work, which was first the deep stirring of the soil alongside the dormant "rattoons" and then, beginning in late February, the fresh planting of fields in which the three-year cycle of sugar-cane was to begin anew. For the planting and cultivating season additional negroes were engaged in February; and early in March the force was recruited with twenty Portuguese laborers. For March 18 the record runs: "Hoe hands left the field, because they said the task was too large." Five days later the management reduced the daily hoeing stint by one-third, and work was resumed. From the beginning of May to the middle of July the fields were cultivated with lighter ploughs, drawn by one or two mules; and the hoeing continued till the first of August. With the crop now "laid by", miscellaneous work filled the time of a reduced corps in the late summer and early fall. Harvest began October 26, with an enlarged force, paid a dollar a day.

For November 7 the diary reads: "Today being the election day, no field work was done, only 12 white men cording cane at sugar house." This was at the climax of radical rule in Louisiana—the famous Hayes-Tilden contest, which eventually required an electoral commission at Washington to determine for whom the electoral vote of the state should be counted. On election days in subsequent years there were doubtless not so many negroes absent from the plantation. On November 8 the mill began to grind the cane. The diary reports: "We had but a small force; but considering today being after election day, everything went off well enough."

With the harvest now at its crest, and every hour precious for

<sup>27</sup> Manuscript in private possession.

getting the crop out of danger from frost, Sundays were included in the work schedule, though about half the field force usually took half of each Sunday off. The normal distribution of the personnel on the pay-roll at the height of the grinding was about 50 cutting cane, 16 loading the carts, 8 hauling, and 36 operating the mill. The mill doubtless ran night and day; but this was so much a matter of course that the diarist did not note it. From the 280 acres in cane the yield, which was heavily diminished by severe frost and subsequent souring of cane, was 534,000 pounds of sugar and 820 barrels of molasses. There were also gathered as auxiliary products 1640 bushels of corn and 117 loads of peavine and other hay.

As later decades have passed, the rôle of the immigrants has lessened in the South; and nowadays many of the negroes are seeking the higher wages at Northern industrial centres. What will come of this remains to be seen; but the blacks who stay in the Southern fields do not appear to be experiencing any drastic change. A newcomer in Georgia, Frances Butler Leigh, the daughter of Fanny Kemble—whose book is an implicit commentary upon her mother's *Journal*—wrote in 1866:

I generally found that if I wanted a thing done I first had to tell the negroes to do it, then show them how, and finally do it myself. Their way of managing not to do it was very ingenious, for they always were perfectly good-tempered, and received my orders with, "Dat's so, missus; just as missus says," and then always somehow or other left the thing undone.<sup>28</sup>

A migrant to Mississippi, having chafed for ten years at similar experiences, wrote in 1919: "A field negro lives in a kind of perpetual doze, a dreamy haze. . . . Nothing disturbs for any length of time the uniform and listless torpor of his existence. . . . Life moves at a low pressure; at times the wheels can barely be seen to turn."<sup>29</sup>

The tether binding the two races in a single system has been broken by many individuals—negroes have set up for themselves, and whites have dispensed altogether with negro labor. But with most the tether has merely been lengthened, to the mingled gratification and regret of nearly all concerned. The rural negroes in bulk remain primitive and slack. Poverty has been a clog upon the whole Southern community; and negro slackness, along with poor soil, has been a chief cause of poverty.

The most common tether continues to be the plantation system, with tenancy the most widely prevalent basis. But whether the

<sup>28</sup> *Ten Years on a Georgia Plantation*, p. 57.

<sup>29</sup> Howard Snyder, "Plantation Pictures", in *Atlantic Monthly*, CXXVII, 171,

scheme be that of wages or crop-sharing, there is not much turn-over except perhaps at the year-end; habitations are fixed for the year; life is lived in family units; and white folk, often of high grade, are tolerantly and affably, if patronizingly, concerned close at hand with the improvement not only of negro work but of negro life.

But we have not come to praise the plantation, and certainly not to bury it. That system now flourishes in California and Colorado, in the West Indies and the East Indies; and its introduction even into England is advocated as a means of improvement.<sup>30</sup> It is idle to expect its early demise in the "black belt" of the United States, where the census takers in a confessedly incomplete survey in 1910 found 39,073 plantations operating on a tenant basis with as many as five tenant families each, to say nothing of the many estates cultivated by wage labor.<sup>31</sup>

ULRICH B. PHILLIPS.

<sup>30</sup> Sir A. Daniel Hall has just written, concerning English agriculture: "For obvious reasons the small farm is less efficient, less economic of human labor than the large one. It is handicapped physically in that the size of its fields does not permit of the effective use of machinery or the orderly disposition of labor. Overhead charges are high; the capitalization of the small farm is excessive. . . . Intellectually the small farming community tends to become hidebound and unprogressive." The road to future improvement, he continues, is toward large corporation farms, in which profit-sharing may well be a feature. "The unit of farming should be something between two and ten thousand acres of mixed farming, and the management should be a hierarchy of director and assistants such as prevails in any great business." *Atlantic Monthly*, CXXXV, 684, 685 (May, 1925).

<sup>31</sup> *Thirteenth Census of the United States*, V, 877-889.

## GERMANY AND THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

THE opening of certain European archives has not only shed a flood of light on many a dark place in the international problems of the old world but has made it possible to re-examine some of the questions in which the United States has been interested during the last half-century. Especially is this the case where those issues have in any way had to do with the German Empire. On the basis of materials previously available, and perhaps colored by certain preconceived notions, it has been thought that most European nations were sympathetic with Spain and more or less passively hostile to the United States during the controversy over the Cuban situation and that Germany in particular was neutral only in the most formal sense. Documents recently brought to light from the imperial archives afford an opportunity to test these beliefs again.<sup>1</sup> Undoubtedly when more of the archives, particularly those of Great Britain and France, are bared, opinions now formed may have to be further revised. British, French, and Russian official documents and a growing volume of personal reminiscences, letters, and the like will reveal forces which are now more or less obscured.

In the latter part of 1897 public opinion in the United States forced the McKinley administration to take a more positive stand on the Cuban situation. Minister Woodford was directed to present to the Spanish Cabinet a formal statement that the American government felt that some method must be found forthwith to bring to an end the reign of disorder in Cuba, and he was authorized to tender the good offices of the United States to aid in its accomplishment.<sup>2</sup> Thereupon the German emperor was moved to propose that the Foreign Office consider the possibility of a European gesture in the

<sup>1</sup> *Die Grosse Politik der Europäischen Kabinette, 1871-1914: Sammlung der Diplomatischen Akten des Auswärtigen Amtes*, im Auftrage des Auswärtigen Amtes herausgegeben von Johannes Lepsius, Albrecht Mendelssohn Bartholdy, und Friedrich Thimme (Berlin, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, 1922 ff.) The material bearing directly on the attitude of the German government during the Spanish-American controversy is found for the most part in vol. XV., published in 1924.

<sup>2</sup> The formal note addressed by Woodford to the Duke of Tetuan, minister for foreign affairs, Sept. 23, 1897, is found in *Papers relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States with the Annual Message of the President transmitted to Congress December 5, 1898*, pp. 568-573. A few days earlier Mr. Woodford had communicated orally the gist of his instructions.

interests of the Spanish monarchy.<sup>3</sup> The despatch which Acting Secretary von Rotenhan sent to Eulenburg, ambassador at Vienna, however, modified the imperial outburst by stating that a German proposal was not to be of such a nature that it might cause unpleasant American reactions and must be based upon an understanding that France, England, and Russia stood together with Germany in taking such a step.<sup>4</sup> To a considerable degree this note embodied the policy which characterized the subsequent course of the German government on the question of intervention. There was a desire to prevent anything which might deal a blow at the monarchical principle, coupled with a fear of the political and economic readjustments which might follow a serious outcome of the differences between Spain and the United States. Nevertheless certain immediate factors, especially those of an economic nature, had to be kept in mind: next to those of Great Britain, Germany's imports from and exports to the United States exceeded those of any other European nation, and the recently enacted Dingley Tariff authorized the President to relax duties in favor of a nation which made reciprocal concessions. A precipitate move in which Germany figured too prominently might produce unpleasant results.

Count Eulenburg, when he received the despatch embodying the emperor's views, telegraphed from Romintin that he was skeptical about inducing England and France to share in representations. He believed that the best procedure was secretly to incite Austria, so closely bound to Spain by dynastic ties, to take the first step. He doubted whether republican France could be stirred up on the question of saving the throne for the queen regent and the infant king, but he thought that the Continental powers might be united against "overseas covetousness" of colonial possessions.<sup>5</sup> Bülow, with the approval of the Kaiser, agreed with Eulenburg that the suggestion respecting Austria was, all things considered, the most promising, and a week later Prince Lichnowsky, the chargé at Vienna, was told, in case the question of intervention came up again, to emphasize the fact that more serious complications could be avoided only if there was a united European stand. Germany could not take the initiative, but it would be ready to entertain "all suitable propositions which reach us from London or Paris—perhaps at Austrian initia-

<sup>3</sup> "In einer Aufwallung seines monarchischen Solidaritätsgefühls." *Die Grosse Politik*, XV, 3, note.

<sup>4</sup> Decoded telegram forwarding a message telegraphed the Foreign Office by von Bülow, Sept. 29, 1897, *ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.



tion".<sup>6</sup> Lichnowsky, however, found that Count Goluchowski was not inclined to make the first move, fearing that he would not have the Austrian Cabinet behind him.

From the middle of October, 1897, until well into the following February the whole matter was quiescent. Both the Spanish and the American governments appeared to feel that affairs were shaping themselves toward a favorable outcome.<sup>7</sup> Then came that series of episodes—the Dupuy de Lôme letter, Senator Proctor's speech, the destruction of the *Maine*, accompanied all the time by the jingo newspaper campaign—which increased the resentment of the people of the United States against Spain. At the same time with the publication of the Dupuy de Lôme letter, February 9, the movements of the American naval units so alarmed the Spanish government that, approaching Radowitz in Madrid and Bülow in Berlin, it asked if Germany would not be willing to head a European demonstration in behalf of the monarchical principle "against American republican encroachments". Bülow, in a note to Radowitz,<sup>8</sup> pointed out that the emperor was always ready to safeguard that principle, but maintained that a German suggestion would not be the proper method for accomplishing the desired end. It could scarcely be expected, he said, that France would join heartily in such a gesture; however, if the French government could be persuaded to take the lead on grounds of her material interests (and her close financial and political relations with Spain for more than a generation emphasized these), then the Spanish government could be assured that Germany was always ready to support the move.

Here the matter stood. Neither Austria, France, nor Germany was willing to take the first step. Each gave assurances that it would be found in the front rank of those supporting an action started by another.<sup>9</sup> France might have been willing to take the

<sup>6</sup> This telegram of Oct. 7 was suggested by Friedrich von Holstein. *Die Grosse Politik*, XV, 6-7.

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, Woodford's despatches of Nov. 27 and Dec. 7 (*Foreign Relations*, 1898, pp. 617-644, 645), as well as those which passed between the Spanish legation in Washington and Madrid, *Spanish Diplomatic Correspondence and Documents, 1896-1900, presented to the Cortes by the Minister of State* (translation), pp. 38-80, *passim*.

<sup>8</sup> Feb. 15, *Die Grosse Politik*, XV, 7-8.

<sup>9</sup> Eulenburg wrote from Vienna that Goluchowski told him that the Austrian government was not strong enough to risk taking the first step. The Marquis de Reverseaux, the French ambassador at Vienna, told Eulenburg that a united European demonstration would be necessary and assented to the latter's suggestion that England and France, with American colonial possessions, were most nearly concerned. They could not count on Russia, however, and concerning England "he spoke very pessimistically and showed an unusual degree of aversion

initiative, but she feared that England and Russia were not to be counted on; Austria felt herself too weak to inaugurate a demonstration and, moreover, in Goluchowski's opinion, France and England, whose material interests in their American colonies were not seriously threatened, were the natural leaders. He was convinced that a mere diplomatic protest would be futile; "only by a united and energetic naval demonstration" would any satisfaction be obtained. In the middle of March the Austrian ambassador in Berlin, Szögyény, approached Bülow anew with the suggestion that the German government take some action. Bülow, in a despatch to Eulenburg,<sup>20</sup> went over the whole ground. The utmost that could be obtained was a polite protest at Washington, a mere academic gesture; France was unwilling to go farther because Russia, notoriously on friendly terms with the United States, balked at anything stronger, and the political organs of England very clearly showed that her government valued American friendship more than that of Spain. Under such conditions a move on the part of either Austria or Germany would be worse than useless. Nevertheless, he went on, it was a shame that the queen regent should be made to suffer for Spain's century of colonial blundering. Might there not be some chance of settling the Cuban issue through the recently proposed suggestion of papal interposition or mediation? If anything could be obtained from this it would greatly relieve the dynastic situation in Spain because nowhere on earth was the influence of the pope so great. Some third power, however, must broach the matter to the papal see, and Austria's Cabinet was pre-eminently fitted to estimate the value of this plan of papal arbitration.<sup>21</sup> On March 26 Bülow telegraphed Otto von Bülow, the Prussian envoy to the papal see, to inform Cardinal Kopp, prince bishop of Breslau, who was then in Rome, confidentially that the suggestion for papal mediation had come from Berlin. He pointed out that no one in Spain, with the possible exception of the Socialists, would object to any decision the pope might reach. The

to the Island Kingdom which placed obstacles in the way of necessary French colonial expansion in every quarter of the globe". Eulenburg to Hohenlohe, Feb. 23, *Die Grosse Politik*, XV, 9-10.

<sup>20</sup> Mar. 15, *ibid.*, pp. 10-12.

<sup>21</sup> Meantime, discovering that so far as France was concerned Russia's attitude was a decisive factor, the Spanish government had tried to get into closer touch with St. Petersburg and for a time evidently thought that expressions of interest presaged something more encouraging. But this expectation faded away. A direct request from Spain for German initiative brought the response that she could make no move until France indicated definitely that her co-operation was to be counted on irrespective of Russia's stand. Bülow to Radowitz, Mar. 17, *Die Grosse Politik*, XV, 12-14.

telegram was followed by a letter in which the substance of a despatch just received from Madrid was incorporated. It stated that an increasing number of influential people in Spain believed that Cuba, always a menace, would ultimately have to be relinquished, and this knowledge might smooth the path of papal arbitration. Bülow himself thought that the pope might do a service to all concerned by giving Cuba its independence and freeing Spain from the Cuban debt, a part of which might possibly be assumed by the United States.

On the same day that Otto von Bülow was instructed to confer with Cardinal Kopp, Radowitz telegraphed that the Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs had formally asked the representatives of Germany, Austria, France, Russia, Italy, and England to request their governments to urge both Spain and the United States to submit their differences to arbitration in order to avert a conflict which impended as a result of Minister Woodford's note of March 23.<sup>12</sup> Bülow again repeated the German formula: the emperor could not take the initiative in the Spanish-American controversy. On the twenty-ninth the German Foreign Office received a code telegram from Rome in which Otto von Bülow said that two days previously the pope had directed Archbishop Ireland to go to Washington to "work diligently with the President, who is well disposed toward him", for a friendly termination of the conflict. Bülow reported, however, that the cardinal did not believe the giving up of Cuba would save the Spanish monarchy.<sup>13</sup> The following day Bülow was informed that his Holiness, on the strength of a conversation with the Spanish ambassador, had come to the conclusion that the Spanish government would not be able to consent to the cession of Cuba, but nevertheless the papal nuncio at Madrid would be directed to ascertain the attitude of influential people.<sup>14</sup> The pope's suspicions were apparently well founded, for on the first of April Bülow notified the Kaiser that the nuncio had been assured that the Spanish government would not accede to an arbitration based on the cession

<sup>12</sup> In a letter dated Mar. 22, Woodford embodied the contents of a telegram which stated the gist of his communication that day made informally to the Minister of Colonies and communicated officially the next day to the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the presence of the Minister of Colonies. The substance of the message was that unless a satisfactory solution not only of the *Maine* affair but of the whole situation could be made within a few days the President would be obliged to lay the matter before Congress. *Foreign Relations*, 1898, pp. 696-697.

<sup>13</sup> *Die Grosse Politik*, XV, 17.

<sup>14</sup> Bülow stated that Cardinal Rampolla advised maintaining the strictest secrecy about the whole thing.

of the island.<sup>15</sup> Here the plan for papal mediation fell to the ground. This did not, however, mean that the pope ceased to work for peace. In Madrid and in Washington efforts were made to bring the parties to a common understanding and it is clear that, at the same time that McKinley was striving to hold the dogs of war, Señor Gullon was attempting to yield enough to avert hostilities and not therewith precipitate an uprising against the monarchy and the government in Spain. It was primarily due to papal interposition that Madrid on April 9 determined to suspend hostilities in Cuba by declaring an armistice. It was too late to prevent the President's sending his message on intervention to Congress.<sup>16</sup>

While developments from the plan for papal mediation or arbitration were awaited, the proposition of a collective note to the Washington and Madrid governments was brought up. On April 4 Bülow telegraphed Holleben, the German ambassador in Washington, that the Austro-Hungarian government had directed its minister, acting in common with the representatives of the other five powers, to approach the American government in the interests of peace. "When and *so far* as all five ministers act together", was the cautious instruction, "you are empowered to share in the step, since the Vienna Cabinet wishes it." The communication emphasized the fact that since, judging from the previous attitude of England, Russia, and France, the step would be "avowedly only platonic", it would be well to find out from the Spanish minister what were the chances of papal mediation.<sup>17</sup> A few days later another telegram again warned Holleben that he must proceed cautiously: Germany must

<sup>15</sup> A confidential telegram, Mar. 31, from Bülow to Radowitz is interesting. Emphasizing the fact that the suggestion for papal mediation originated in Berlin, Bülow said that the German government had no desire to assume the moral responsibility for the cession of Cuba; "while, on the other hand, the acceptance of papal arbitration by the American side *without* assurance of concession . . . seems quite hopeless". He further remarked that the hesitation of European powers, "among them France and Russia, perhaps induced by England's silence" was not calculated to impress Americans. *Die Grosse Politik*, XV, 18-19.

<sup>16</sup> See despatches in *Spanish Correspondence and Documents*, pp. 99-116, *passim*. It is clear that President McKinley would have been willing to accept papal mediation if Congress had not pressed him. A note of Bülow's of Apr. 5 records that he told the Spanish ambassador that if he [Bülow] were Spanish Secretary of Foreign Affairs he would give the pope *carte blanche* in order to avert war. He added to this his belief that there was reason for thinking that the European powers would take no effective step on behalf of Spain. The ambassador replied that further yielding would mean the fall of the government and the dynasty: "Spain", he said, "does not need to fear the war, but Europe ought to fear the overthrow of the Spanish monarchy and further extension of the power of America." *Die Grosse Politik*, XV, 20.

<sup>17</sup> This note was of Holstein's framing.

take part in mediation only "so far as is unavoidable". Mistrust must not be aroused either with the powers or in America. The same day, April 7, Holleben cabled that the six representatives had presented a note to the President expressing the hope that further negotiations would lead to an agreement which would insure peace and afford guaranties of the restoration of order in Cuba.<sup>18</sup> Two days later Radowitz announced that the representatives of the powers had that day given to Señor Gullon a note of a tenor similar to the one presented to President McKinley. Gullon's response, which came on the afternoon of the same day, contained the information that the government, at the solicitation of the Holy Father and on the friendly advice of the six powers, had already directed a cessation of hostilities in Cuba. The following day Señor Polo de Bernabé, the new minister in Washington, informed the Secretary of State of the concession, and Woodford in Madrid kept the wires hot with telegrams urging delay in sending the intervention message. On the eleventh the Spanish minister gave Judge Day a copy of General Blanco's proclamation declaring an armistice, but that afternoon the message was sent to Congress without intimation of the concession which had been made.

The reception of the message by the House of Representatives was such that two days later a resolution authorizing the President to intervene in Cuba was passed. This made it appear that war was inevitable. Nevertheless those who, outside the administration, knew of Spain's yielding on the question of the armistice believed still that there was a basis for further negotiation, and from this came the episode which four years later aroused much controversy. On April 15 Bülow telegraphed to the Kaiser the contents of a code cable just received from Holleben which stated that "very surprisingly the English ambassador took the initiative for a new joint action of the representatives of the Great Powers" in Washington. "We believe", Holleben went on, "that the queen [regent] is represented in

<sup>18</sup> The text of the note, dated the sixth, is in *Foreign Relations*, 1898, p. 740. On Apr. 6 Hay telegraphed from London that Mr. Balfour told him that "Pauncefote's instructions were formal to do nothing about collective representations except what would be agreeable to the President". MS. Department of State, Great Britain. When a controversy later arose about the proposition of Apr. 14 the Washington correspondent of the *London Times* wrote regarding the note of the sixth: "Not only was the original note presented on April 7 by the Diplomatic Body and drafted by Lord Pauncefote submitted to the President for approval in advance, but the text was concerted between Lord Pauncefote and Mr. Day, then Secretary of State; alterations were suggested by Mr. Day and accepted by Lord Pauncefote, and the President's answer was written with the text of the note before him." *The Times Weekly Edition*, Feb. 14, 1902.

this matter by the Queen of England." The note which was forwarded to the European chancelleries expressed the opinion that the Spanish note of April 9 afforded a good basis on which to reconsider the whole question; if the powers shared this view it would be necessary to dispel the error that the civilized world believed armed intervention imperative.<sup>19</sup> Holleben himself was "cool" toward the whole proposition. Bülow made no comments on the Washington cable when he forwarded it to the emperor, but the latter shared Holleben's skepticism, if his feelings may be judged by a note he wrote on the margin of the despatch: "Ich halte sie für gänzlich verfehlt, zwecklos und daher schädlich! Wir blamieren uns vor den Amerikanern ebenso wie vor den Griechen und Türken, die auch auf unsere Kollektivnoten pfeifen!"<sup>20</sup>

Bülow, as soon as he received Holleben's telegram, had directed the German ambassador in St. Petersburg to find out whether Russia, "up to now most reticent", would participate in the move. The next day he was able to inform Wilhelm II. that Count Muraviev, while not undertaking to speak officially, was of the opinion that it would do no good and would arouse feeling in the United States—"would be injurious to the relations of the European monarchies to America". On finding no sympathetic response in England, Germany, or Russia, this proposition for another collective note was dropped and the whole affair buried in the European archives until, in 1902, it became the storm centre of a short-lived but vigorous discussion.<sup>21</sup> The facts appear to be these: Sir Julian Pauncefote had

<sup>19</sup> "Unter diesen Umständen glauben die hiesigen Vertreter, Grossmächte könnten die Aufmerksamkeit der hiesigen Regierung auf die spanische Note vom 10. lenken und erklären, die bewaffnete Intervention erscheine ihnen nicht gerechtfertigt", was Holleben's translation of the rather strong expression.

<sup>20</sup> On the margin beside a sentence of Holleben's which read, "A step here could only injure the standing of the powers unless they give their representatives something with which to respond fittingly to an unfriendly answer", the Kaiser wrote "richtig"; and his comment when Bülow spoke of the "Kollektivdemonstration" was "Ich bin gegen diesen Schritt!" The despatch with the comments is in *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 22-24.

<sup>21</sup> This controversy, which lies outside the scope of this study, began when Lord Cranborne, under-secretary of state for foreign affairs, answered a question in the Commons on Jan. 20, 1902. *Parliamentary Debates*, fourth ser., CI. 311. It came at a time when Prince Henry of Prussia was on his way to the United States to be present at the launching of the Kaiser's new yacht and when there was considerable evidence that the German government was exerting itself to create a good impression in America. The Venezuelan episode was looming on the horizon. The steps of the controversy may be found in contemporary newspapers. Briefer summaries from various points of view are in *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 24, note, and F. Charmes, "Chronique de la Quinzaine", in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, CLXX. 476-478. George W. Smalley in *Anglo-American Memories* (1912), II.

no instructions to join in any joint or collective note after that of April 7; he was, however, persuaded, as dean of the diplomatic group, by the representations of the Austrian minister, who acted without any direct order but under general instructions from his government, to convene the representatives of the powers. Sir Julian was evidently the more willing to accede to the request since he was personally convinced that the Spanish concession of April 9 made precipitate action by the United States unnecessary. He framed a rough draft of the views expressed at the meeting and this was turned into French by Ambassador Cambon, who in the process modified somewhat the original in such a way as to make its expressions more pointed, and apparently Pauncefote did not grasp the significance of the changes when he signed it.<sup>22</sup> Both Russian and German governments were convinced that the original incitement to the step had come from Pauncefote and that he was acting in accord with definite instructions from his government.<sup>23</sup> Holleben was clearly mystified by it all. Writing to Prince Hohenlohe on April 23, 1898, to say that the time was coming when the European powers would have to be on their guard to prevent their interests being injured by the war, he emphasized the fact that they must stand together.<sup>24</sup> Austria, Italy, and France—and through her, Russia—he thought could be counted on, but "the hesitation of England appears quite like a riddle here", a sentiment to which the emperor responded with the comment "uns auch!" England first showed an "inclination toward the United States", and then joined in the collective note, but after this nothing happened, "at least so my French colleague said, on account of the lukewarm attitude of England". And now, Holleben went on, came a torrent of press articles in England and America emphasizing the fraternal note, Henry White's hurried visit to Washington on an ostensibly secret mission, and Hay's speech at the London dinner. Sir Julian, however, made fun of it all and called

178-185, gives his version of the affair as derived from Lord Pauncefote, an epitome of what he cabled to the *Times* from Washington.

<sup>22</sup> See despatch from the Washington correspondent of the *Times* in the *Times Weekly Edition* of Feb. 21, 1902. It is to this letter that Smalley refers in his *Anglo-American Memories*, II. 183-184. It was not, however, on account of this episode that Holleben was recalled, as Smalley thought; see Joseph B. Bishop, *Theodore Roosevelt and his Time*, I. 223-225. See also Holleben's telegram of Feb. 13, 1898, *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 29-30.

<sup>23</sup> See editors' note in *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 24; also Cassini's statement of Feb. 3, 1902, as given in the *New York Herald* of Feb. 4.

<sup>24</sup> On the margin beside this sentiment the Kaiser wrote: "Sehr richtig aber der Deibel kriege diese widerhaarigen Kerls zusammen." *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 28.



the demonstrations of friendship hypocritical, to which the Kaiser remarked, in a marginal note, "Er lügt vielleicht".<sup>25</sup>

The official German position on mediation and possible intervention appears to have been this: the government, and especially the emperor, was alarmed at the potential results a struggle might have for the Spanish dynasty because, primarily, of its probable widespread effects for the monarchical principle everywhere; then there was fear that success on the part of the United States in an armed conflict might be attended by disturbing effects on European balance, especially with respect to colonial power. Along with this, and as one aspect of it, there loomed an apprehension that the United States was assuming too prominent a place in world affairs. There can be little doubt that the emperor—it is not so clear that Hohenlohe or Bülow shared the idea—would have participated in any sort of a demonstration which promised success, but there was always a lurking suspicion that any aggressive action might prove a boomerang. The German government was not going, if it could help it, to take a position which would lead to resentment in America. It is apparent that Germany—and again this primarily means Wilhelm II.—tried to encourage every promising suggestion, letting it be understood that she would support any move that was hopeful but would not take the ostensible initiative. One is reminded of the cat and the chestnuts. Withal, however, there is no question that the actual course of Germany was circumspect and such as to give the American government and people no ground for objection.<sup>26</sup>

During the Spanish war German public opinion as expressed in newspaper items, in magazine articles, and in other ways was gener-

<sup>25</sup> At the end of the telegram the Kaiser expressed his feelings in this burst: "England wants to play the same game she did years ago when avowedly she provoked the outbreak of the Greco-Turkish war. She stirs up action of all the powers and apparently participates until they have compromised themselves with the belligerents; then she draws back, pharisaically beats her breast, declares she never had a part in it, secretly joins with one of the combatants—naturally always the stronger—and incites it against the Continental powers. Meantime at their [the Powers'] expense she begs special trading concessions from it. England won't belong to Europe, it won't throw in its lot with the Continental Powers [this clause was written in English], but wants to establish an independent continent for herself between this continent and Asia or America."

<sup>26</sup> When on June 5 Holleben suggested the possibility of a move for peace by the Continental powers, the Kaiser wrote on the margin of the telegram, "We don't get caught in such a trap again; until one or the other of the belligerents has had its fill of fighting mediation is folly." *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 27, note. Later, on July 16, Richthofen telegraphed Radowitz that it would not be feasible to try to have Continental mediation unless England could be brought to take a part.

ally, although not universally, sympathetic with Spain rather than with the United States. Of course a suspicion would immediately be entertained that such a feeling was but a reflection of the governmental attitude. This, however, does not seem to have been the case, and there is considerable evidence that the government regretted this outspoken hostility. The popular German attitude was capitalized by those who wished to strengthen the bonds between England and America, for the papers of both countries did not hesitate to give prominence to despatches from Germany. Officially the German government followed a course of strict neutrality, although in accordance with its custom it did not make public proclamation of neutrality.<sup>27</sup>

From the actual outbreak of hostilities to the time when the peace treaty was framed the principal concern of the German government was as to the effect the war might have on colonial readjustments. There is no need to point out the fact that Germany entered the colonial scramble rather late or to emphasize the zeal with which she sought outlying possessions: the lease of Kiao-Chow, the Samoan controversy, and her African aspirations all call attention to the attraction which any stray bits of territory, with economic or strategic possibilities, had for Germans. Dewey's defeat of the Spanish squadron in Manila Bay, then, drew attention immediately to the Far East. Prince Henry of Prussia, then commanding the Asiatic squadron, cabled Bülow from Hong-Kong on May 11: "A German merchant from Manila has stated in a way most worthy of credence that a rebellion has justified itself in the Philippines and will succeed; that the natives would gladly place themselves under the protection of a European power, especially Germany." A day or so later came another cable, this time from the consul at Manila, sent *via* Hong-Kong, corroborating Prince Henry's message. The insurgents, according to Consul Krüger, were not fighting to change masters; they did not, however, think that they were capable of establishing a republic and believed they would be best off as a kingdom. "Existing indications are that the matter will probably terminate with an offer of the throne to a German prince. Ought the thing to be allowed to develop freely, or should it be waved aside?"

When Bülow forwarded this information to the emperor,<sup>28</sup> he went into a long discussion of the tempting suggestion in all its bear-

<sup>27</sup> See *Autobiography of Andrew D. White*, II, 170 ff. Mr. White's published despatches (*Foreign Relations*, 1898) contain no information on the topic; their contents are confined to such things as American fruits in Germany, the treatment of Mormon missionaries, and other innocuous subjects. The unpublished despatches, however, confirm Mr. White's statements about her neutrality.

<sup>28</sup> May 14, *Die Grosse Politik*, XV, 33-38.

ings. There might arise, he thought, a situation such as that which had faced France in Mexico or Italy in Eritrea; the mere desire of the natives was not enough to act upon. If England and America should agree about the future of the islands, then not only would this issue be settled but matters of far more import, for "in any case, in my humble opinion, the control of the sea in the end may rest on the question of who rules the Philippines, directly or indirectly". Both Russia and France were concerned about the affair. If England could be persuaded to withhold her consent, then the United States could hardly be expected to keep the islands. It would be well, said Bülow, to send Admiral von Diederichs to the spot to report the situation so that the government might be able to determine what to do before the insurgents got the upper hand or any serious consequences ensued, for precipitate action not only would conflict with "the principle of legitimacy, which forms the basis of our relations with Russia and Austria-Hungary", but it might cause Germany "to be drawn into a struggle not only with America but with England". Germany, moreover, must avoid raising a coalition against her, something which might easily happen. Both Russia and France, to say nothing of England, had interests which, judging by more or less official press items, involved the Philippines. For a prospect of a successful move regarding the Philippines there must be a previous understanding with "one or more first class naval powers". If such an understanding could be reached with England and America, or with England alone, it would give much more security than one with Russia and France. There were two other possibilities: the Philippines might be divided, or an independent Philippine state might, as a neutralized nation, be guaranteed its integrity by a congress of naval powers. It would do no harm to have Hatzfeldt find out in London where England stood; whether she desired to share in the "*spolia opima*" or whether it would better suit her purpose to have no one obtain anything.

The emperor, expressing his views in a few comments on the margin of the letter, agreed with his minister. He was, however, of the opinion that the Philippines, wholly or in part, must not pass to another power "without Germany's receiving an equivalent compensation".<sup>29</sup> If the time was not ripe for an open declaration the best thing would be to work for neutralization as a temporary solution. Hatzfeldt's inquiries brought the information that Lord Salis-

<sup>29</sup> So Bülow reported to Hatzfeldt, May 18, when he detailed the substance of an oral conversation with the Kaiser. *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 39. See also *id.*, XIV., Band I., p. 261, where Bülow makes a list of what Germany desired in the Pacific.

bury thought the American government would not welcome any suggestion as to the disposition of the archipelago. The obvious inference was that England was disinclined to take the matter up, and this for the time put an end to active prosecution of the thought of neutralization.

Meantime Bülow's suggestion of sending von Diederichs to Manila was carried out. This, to the disgust of Ambassador Holleben, stirred up considerable excitement in the United States;<sup>30</sup> press notices indicated that there was a feeling that Germany was at least somewhat officious. From Cambon, who, Holleben wrote, emphasized his instructions to collaborate with his German colleague, not much comfort was obtained, for he reported that in Europe, even in Paris, the sending of von Diederichs was looked upon as something which might give offense.<sup>31</sup> An item in the *Washington Post*, saying that the Department of State would seek explanations in Berlin, brought a denial very gratifying to the German envoy. He did, however, casually ask Judge Day at a reception whether, as the despatch said, the ambassador at Berlin had been instructed to obtain "suitable pacificatory information". He was apparently relieved when Day remarked, "Oh no, that's only ornamental".

The very day on which Holleben sent his telegram the Secretary of State had cabled Ambassador White that no assurances need be given as to the Philippines, but this was followed by another despatch saying that the question of the islands was still unsettled and that the issue must not be involved with that of Samoa.<sup>32</sup> There is no evidence that any member of the administration had any definite information about the various propositions which had been occupying the attention of Kaiser Wilhelm and his government. Nevertheless it is apparent that there was a certain amount of uneasiness over the general situation, for on June 18 Mr. White wrote about the unfriendly attitude of the German press and commented on a suggested scheme of sending Joseph Brückner, of the *Illinois Staatszeitung*, to Germany to work for a better feeling between the two peoples. Four days later a telegram called attention to the large German force at Manila and asked White whether it was likely to be

<sup>30</sup> Telegram of June 13 and letter elaborating the subject June 17, *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 41-42.

<sup>31</sup> " . . . the cloven hoof appeared an instant when he informed me that he had news from Paris that the mission of von Diederichs made a sensation there. Either it was true, in which case he ought not to have said it to me, or it was not true, in which case he needlessly allowed me to have a glimpse of his sentiments."

<sup>32</sup> MS. Department of State, Germany, June 13.

withdrawn or reduced.<sup>33</sup> There is, however, no available evidence to show that there was any grave concern, for the inquiry was not followed up, and White appeared to be more seriously disturbed by the unfriendly tone of the newspapers both in Germany and the United States than he did about possible German interposition in the Philippines.

Meantime Spain herself brought forward the suggestion in Berlin, Paris, and St. Petersburg that the powers assume control at least of Manila,<sup>34</sup> and Consul Krüger sent word<sup>35</sup> that the Spanish governor-general would welcome an order to turn the city over to the commanders of the naval forces of neutrals then in Philippine waters. This official had even gone so far as to confer with von Diederichs and suggest that he take the initiative, but the latter told him that he was disinclined to act without special instructions. Krüger added that there was evidence that the English and Americans had reached an understanding of some sort. The official request from Madrid appeared to make an opening for the project of neutralization, but the cool reception accorded it both in Paris and St. Petersburg effectually prevented any further prosecution of the notion. Indeed, while neutralization was not completely dropped as a possible future expedient, from the latter part of June it was no longer prominent.

On the first day of July a telegram received by Holleben in Washington indicated that the German government was turning again to the idea that a division of the spoils might be the most satisfactory method of securing something tangible.<sup>36</sup> "His Majesty the Emperor deems it a principal object of German policy to leave unused no opportunity which may arise from the Spanish-American War to obtain maritime fulcra in East Asia", was the sentence with which the despatch began. Under the circumstances it would be the duty of the ambassador, through observation and discreet inquiry, to find out the strength of the annexationists in the United States, as well as to discover what people in Washington believed was the payment England would exact for her support. He was to drop the suggestion that, if properly compensated in matters like "coaling-stations, maritime fulcra and the like", Germany was in a position to be of much greater assistance to the United States than was Eng-

<sup>33</sup> Letter of June 18 and telegram of June 22, MS. Department of State, Germany.

<sup>34</sup> In a telegram to Wilhelm II., June 21, Bülow stated that the proposition had been laid before him and that he had word that the Russian and French governments had been similarly approached. *Die Grosse Politik*, XV, 42-43.

<sup>35</sup> Telegram from Rieloff at Hong-Kong, *ibid.*, pp. 43-44.

<sup>36</sup> Bülow to Holleben, *ibid.*, pp. 44-45.

land. This line of approach was much more completely elaborated in a letter to Hatzfeldt, who was instructed to get in touch with the American ambassador in London in order to make the same sort of suggestions to him.<sup>37</sup>

The substance of the argument to be used both in London and Washington may be summarized in this way: from developments in Europe it appeared that England expected the outbreak of a war within the near future, a war which would become world-wide; England needed an ally with a navy, and overtures having been repulsed by Germany, Russia, and France, she turned to Japan and the United States.<sup>38</sup> Japan would be easily drawn in because the Japanese were a warlike people, but with the United States it would be different. That country would be "willing to take part in a world war only if it believed it faced immediate danger and deemed it necessary to have the support of another power to attain its own ends or to hold an advantage already gained". Turning to the actual situation, with the Spanish-American War practically ended, the United States would have to seek support somewhere to hold what a victory might bring. Germany must show that her friendship would be worth more than that of England. To do this it would first be essential to demonstrate that the press attacks on Germany were inspired by England. Next it must be shown that an understanding with Germany, the possessor of fewer colonies than Great Britain, would create a feeling of security, while one with England would eventually force the United States into danger from war, for as things stood Russia and France faced England and Germany was an onlooker. If England formed an alliance with the United States, then Germany

<sup>37</sup> July 6, *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 47-52. The subject-matter of this scheme was, in the opinion of the editors of *Die Grosse Politik*, hatched in the fertile brain of Holstein (p. 49, note). It was responsible for the emperor's belief that, from 1897, there was a drawing together of the Anglo-Saxon world against Germany and that a gentlemen's agreement was made whereby the United States would go to the aid of England and France in case of trouble with Germany or Germany and Austria. See *The Kaiser's Memoirs: Wilhelm II., Emperor of Germany, 1888-1918*, trans. T. R. Ybarra, pp. 71-75. The ex-Kaiser reasserted his belief in the "plot" in an interview with George S. Viereck, as related in *Current History*, November, 1924, pp. 173-175. For a characterization of Friedrich von Holstein, "the mystery man", see Hermann Freiherr von Eckardstein, *Lebenserinnerungen und Politische Denkwürdigkeiten*, I. 12-16.

<sup>38</sup> In a note the editors of *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 52, speak of the "Schreckbild eines englisch-amerikanisch-japanischen Dreibundes" which loomed before the "ever-suspicious spirit of Holstein". The European complications, in Holstein's opinion, were bound to start from English-Portuguese relations based upon the long-standing debt. Hatzfeldt's explanation of the situation is found in the first part of his despatch of July 8, *ibid.*, XIV., Band I., 284-286.

would have to throw her weight on the other side; this would drag America into the whirlpool of European politics, oblige her to increase her armaments in order to be ready for war at a moment's notice, and, all together, seriously threaten the future of her institutions.

Neither Holleben nor Hatzfeldt could send back news which afforded any encouragement for this plan of Holstein's. The former<sup>39</sup> reported that the American administration itself knew too little what its programme was to be or what its own attitude toward the powers, even England, was, to afford anything tangible on which to work for an understanding with Germany. Moreover the sentiment against Germany in the United States was such that leaders of highest reputation would hardly dare take a stand in her favor; besides all this, Congress was about to adjourn and everybody was leaving Washington on account of the heat.<sup>40</sup> Hatzfeldt gently scoffed at the idea of an Anglo-American-Japanese *Dreibund*. Indeed, from remarks Lord Salisbury had made to him he believed that that statesman placed "very limited confidence in their [American] friendship for England". As to approaching Hay, Hatzfeldt knew him of old as a man of extraordinary reticence, and if there were any advances to be made he thought the American ambassador ought to make them. The best way to go about the whole thing, he thought, was to talk frankly with the American ambassador in Berlin and through him make clear to the Americans, "who are little acquainted with European policies", that all the English news about an unfriendly attitude of Germany was founded on design, and "that our pretensions are more moderate than those of the other powers, and America has nothing to fear from them as soon as we are satisfied".<sup>41</sup>

Hatzfeldt's advice was apparently considered good. Mr. White was known to be very favorably inclined toward Germany and the Germans; he had suffered in the storm of anti-American protest in the German press, and it grieved him to think that the people in the United States were reading yarns which were likely to build up lasting resentment against the Kaiser and his people. On July 4, when he made an address at the Leipzig celebration, he had emphasized

<sup>39</sup> Holleben to Foreign Office, July 4. *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 45-46.

<sup>40</sup> Holleben rather plaintively explained that "it would be made easier for me to express the All Highest's intentions as well as to unbosom myself on the possibility of success if a glimpse of the goal of our policy in the matter should be given me". Richthofen somewhat sharply replied that the ambassador was not expected to state the American programme; he was to keep his eyes open and "orient" his government on developments.

<sup>41</sup> Telegram of July 8. *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 52-53.



the good relations which had long existed between the two countries and expressed his belief that the flood of hostility was indicative of a passing mood and that a change would come. While from time to time his suspicions had been stirred by a feeling that the German government was looking for an opportunity to gain something in the East, this did not much trouble him. Two days after Hatzfeldt had given his advice Richthofen had a long talk with White. "I told him", Richthofen reported, "that the acquisition of Samoa (as compensation for Hawaii) and of the Carolines (as satisfaction of national pride after the events of 1885) would be desired for Germany; furthermore one or two positions in the Philippine group and the Sulu Archipelago would be wanted." He explained how much a satisfactory settlement of colonial questions would mean for future German-American relations. Mr. White, according to Richthofen, personally took the same point of view; he was a follower of Cleveland in foreign policy. Except as to Hawaii, the annexation of which he considered useful, he was against American acquisition of outlying colonies, first on account of the heterogeneous elements they would bring into Congress, and secondly because the periodical changes of policy, due to the American governmental system, would not produce efficient colonial administration. So far as he was concerned he would be satisfied with a couple of coaling-stations in the East Indies, together with some in the Antilles. He was ready to do anything to promote good relations between his country and Germany, but at the moment he found himself unable to go further because he had no definite instructions from his government, which as yet had arrived at no definite policy.<sup>42</sup> Furthermore, he could see with equanimity the extension of the German colonial system because he believed it meant the spreading of civilization. The net result of the conversations with White was to encourage, for the moment at least, the belief that the American government might not annex the Philippines or, at a minimum, would not place any obstacle in the way of Germany's acquiring a foothold there.

<sup>42</sup> In a fair copy of the notes of this conversation (*Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 54-59) made on the same day, Richthofen set down at much greater length the details of the talk which, on his side, emphasized the arguments of Holstein put forward as his own *private* opinion. White reported his interview with an "influential person" to Washington and advocated a friendly policy toward Germany. A few days later he sent a copy of the speech he had made at Leipzig, saying he congratulated himself that his remarks were working for a more favorable attitude in Germany. See also his comments in the *Autobiography*, II. 169, the excerpt and comments in *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 54-55, note, and the favorable comment in the *Deutsche Rundschau*, April-September, 1898, p. 308.

Undue optimism, however, was tempered by news from Washington and London. Holleben reported that, while he believed that the President and the Cabinet were opposed to annexation, in the country at large annexationists were rapidly multiplying. Americans, he complained, had little regard for "reciprocity", and would not be inclined to recognize in any tangible manner Germany's friendly attitude.<sup>43</sup> Hatzfeldt, while he did not get much satisfaction from an interview with Hay,<sup>44</sup> did believe that the United States did not intend to keep the Philippines, certainly not more than Manila and the surrounding region as a coaling-station.<sup>45</sup> He thought an understanding might be reached with Washington. While he was inclined to discount Lord Salisbury's remark, made confidentially, that all the fuss about an English-American *rapprochement* was unfounded and ludicrous, nevertheless he thought it might be advisable to suggest to him in a joking manner that out of thankfulness for Germany's neutrality he, Salisbury, ought either to give her a coaling-station in the Philippines or at least support her in the effort to get one. There is no reason to believe that the German Foreign Office had obtained a hint of the telegram sent by Hay to Washington on July 28 wherein he said that Great Britain would prefer to have the United States take the Philippines, but it would have required great stupidity not to gather the general tenor of the lack of responsiveness on the part of British officials. In any case Hatzfeldt's suggestion was discouraged in Berlin, where the opinion was that everything pointed to the probability that, in one way or another, the islands would be brought within the sphere of influence of the United States. The very fact that American withdrawal would lead to a prolonged and bloody struggle between the Spaniards and the insurgents strengthened the annexationists. Furthermore an American newspaper despatch to the effect that the government was about

<sup>43</sup> Holleben to Foreign Office, July 13, *Die Grosse Politik*, XV, 59-60. "Die Selbstsucht der Amerikaner findet ihre Schranken nur in ihrer Eitelkeit", was his comment toward the close of the communication.

<sup>44</sup> He reported that Hay made no reply when he said that Germany would want coaling-stations in the Philippines, nor did he commit himself when the subject of the Carolines came up. When Hatzfeldt remarked that he did not understand what interest the United States had in Samoa, "Mr. Hay immediately and with some emphasis objected that America had great interests in Samoa". *Die Grosse Politik*, XV, 61. The next day Mr. Hay wrote the Department of State an account of the conversation, noting Hatzfeldt's deprecation of the misrepresentations in the American and English press of Germany's attitude on the Philippines; he also remarked that it was "reported" that Germany wanted the Carolines and Samoa. Hay to Day, July 15, 1898, MS. Department of State, Great Britain.

<sup>45</sup> Code telegram to Holstein, Aug. 3, *Die Grosse Politik*, XV, 68-69.

to take and fortify Pago Pago in the Samoas indicated that an aggressive policy would be followed. England would be threatened more than Germany by America's venturing further into the Pacific, hence the Kaiser's government believed that there still might be a possibility of getting Salisbury to adopt the plan of neutralization. Their reasoning also brought them to the conviction that Japan would probably come into the scheme with England, Germany, and the United States, and possibly France and Russia might lend their support later. One of the factors which revived for the moment the idea of neutralization was word from Admiral von Diederichs that he could find no evidence of a strong desire for a German protectorate, as Consul Krüger and Prince Henry had earlier reported.

Uncertainty about what the United States would do was warranted by information which came from Washington and from London, and also from what Ambassador White said. Apparently moved not by recent instructions from the Department of State but by the tone of American press items, White went to Richthofen on July 25 and told him that he had reported his conversations with him to his government without mentioning his name or position.<sup>46</sup> He said that while telegrams he had received indicated a friendly feeling on the American side, nevertheless a definite consideration of the matters they had discussed informally seemed to be "premature". It was his opinion that President McKinley and the administration were opposed to annexation and were inclined to ask only for a coaling-station, but in the country at large the annexationists and the anti-annexationists were lining up. Also in a personal capacity White expressed his conviction that much of the "uneasiness" in the United States would be removed if something could be done about the German war-vessels then in Philippine waters; if, for example, instead of maintaining them at Manila the government should order them to be moved about from time to time. Two days later, from Semmering, Bülow instructed Richthofen to inform the American ambassador that it was his private opinion that the question of the fleet ought not to be taken up formally; it would touch the emperor on a tender spot and might give rise to a popular impression that the United States was interfering in an unwarranted manner in a purely German question.<sup>47</sup> When on the thirtieth White had another inter-

<sup>46</sup> Note by Richthofen, July 25, *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 62-64.

<sup>47</sup> "Es sei jedoch zu befürchten, dass Seine Majestät à distance Tendenz und Tragweite derselben verkennen und ein solches Ansinnen anders beurteilen könnte, welches, wenn es bekannt würde, auch der deutschen öffentlichen Meinung als unmotivierter Eingriff in unsere volkerrechtliche Bewegungsfreiheit erscheinen dürfte." *Ibid.*, p. 64.

view with the under-secretary and was given this information, he immediately denied wishing to say anything which might be misunderstood; he begged Richthofen to consider his words about the squadron at Manila as unspoken. Indeed, he said, he had not desired to intimate that the fleet should be withdrawn, but that it might cause less disturbance if the ships came and went. In this interview again he emphasized his belief that the administration was opposed to annexation and that much of the talk about the subject was for effect.<sup>48</sup> Still, he said, he trusted that the newspaper items about a possible European protest against annexation were not well founded, for the American nation was young and proud and nothing would be more likely to enhance the strength of the annexationists than a feeling that foreign governments were trying to dictate to it.

In reporting this conversation Mr. White stated to the Secretary of State that he had been assured by the under-secretary that the sole reason for the presence of Germany's vessels in Philippine waters was the protection of German interests there; nevertheless, he added, German aspirations for a foothold in the islands were still alive. Later on the same day he wrote that Richthofen denied any knowledge of a proposed European interference in the settlement of the Philippine question, adding that Richthofen intimated that an informal exchange of views in Berlin on the subject of the disposition of such of the islands as the United States did not want would be advantageous. In this, White said, he agreed with the under-secretary.<sup>49</sup> In view of the fact that two days before these letters were written there had come from Hay the statement that England preferred that the United States should take the Philippines and that the growing imperialistic tone of the press may well have been taken by the administration to represent public opinion in the country, it is likely that White's encouragement of German aspirations ran beyond what would be welcome in Washington, but no doubt the German government realized that the American ambassador was expressing his own views which did not coincide with the information which came from Holleben. Indeed, by this time the Kaiser and his advisers had become more or less reconciled to the fact that the utmost which could be obtained would be a coaling-station or two and that Germany must seek compensation elsewhere.

In the meantime, as White had told Richthofen on July 25, the presence of an officer of von Diederichs's rank with a naval force nearly if not quite equal to Dewey's at Manila had aroused much ad-

<sup>48</sup> "Die Rede des Mr. Davis in St. Paul sei lediglich bestimmt für 'home consumption' und 'to make the eagle scream'." *Die Grosse Politik*, XV, 67.

<sup>49</sup> White to Department of State, July 30, MS. Department of State, Germany.

verse comment in the United States. Admiral Dewey himself was much concerned over the attitude of the German commander and awaited with impatience the arrival of naval and military reinforcements.<sup>50</sup> This anxiety, however, does not appear to have been shared by the administration in Washington, although it did at one time stimulate an inquiry of White. In part this lack of apprehension was due to the fact that the government received no word from Dewey on the matter and in part to the real, although not definitely expressed, feeling that the good-will of Great Britain was a stalwart shield. Furthermore one can not fail to get the impression that a sublime ignorance of the intricacies of European politics, coupled with a considerable amount of self-confidence, bred what came close to arrogance regarding the attitude of other nations.

On the German side it is not possible to make a positive statement. There can be little doubt that at the outset, encouraged by reports from Manila, the government resolved to have an officer of high rank on the spot not only to observe and estimate the situation but to be in a position to take positive action if the time for it came. This does not mean that at any time Germany was ready to defy the United States or had the remotest intention of doing so unless it was done in concert with other European powers. If backing for a policy of neutralization could be found, then the presence of von Diederichs with a formidable naval force would have a potent influence not only for stabilizing conditions in the islands but for making Germany a power of first consideration when an ultimate arrangement should be made. Had Dewey not been most naturally anxious regarding his situation, cut off as he was from direct communication with his government and forced to wait weeks for adequate reinforcements, and had von Diederichs been a little less of a typical Prussian officer, disinclined to make any allowances for the extraordinary conditions, it is altogether probable that there would have been no friction.<sup>51</sup> It can be safely said that there was never any real danger of war between the United States and Germany over the episode.<sup>52</sup>

<sup>50</sup> *Autobiography of George Dewey* (1913), ch. XVII., *passim*.

<sup>51</sup> It is not necessary here to go into a consideration of the situation itself. Dewey has told his side in his *Autobiography*, ch. XVII., and in answer to it there is von Diederichs's statement, "Darstellung der Vorgänge vor Manila von Mai bis August, 1898", in *Marine Rundschau*, March, 1914, and appearing in English translation in the *Journal of the Royal Service Institution*, LIX, 421-446 (August, 1914). A comparison of the two accounts is well made by Jeannette Keim in *Forty Years of German-American Political Relations* (Philadelphia, 1919), pp. 220-231. See also note in *Die Grosse Politik*, XV, 62-64.

<sup>52</sup> Eckardstein's statement (*Lebenserinnerungen und Politische Denkwürdigkeiten*, I, 312) that the two countries were "within a hair's breadth of war" is

Yet, in spite of all this, the temper of the people of the two countries was dangerously roused, in part by the flood of provocative newspaper items which appeared all through July and the early part of August both in Germany and the United States.<sup>53</sup> Nearly every communication which Ambassador White sent to Washington had some reference to the hostile German press, and frequently he spoke with some bitterness of the inspired anti-German articles in English and American papers. The approaching end of the conflict in the West Indies, as well as the relief which had reached Dewey, together with information which came from England, relieved whatever tension there had been; if there had been a critical period the atmosphere was clearing.<sup>54</sup> Intimations had already come to indicate that Spain was about ready to give up the struggle, and on August 12 an armistice was arranged through Ambassador Cambon. On August 18 Ambassador White sent word that the German naval forces in the Philippines were to be reduced and that von Diederichs had been ordered to Batavia with the *Kaiser* to represent Germany at the celebration of the coronation of the Queen of the Netherlands.

As soon as news of the armistice reached Berlin all idea of a German protectorate or even of a neutralized Philippine state was abandoned. There still remained some hope that the United States would not stand in the way of Germany's obtaining a coaling-station or two somewhere in the archipelago, but the Foreign Office now turned its attention to securing other colonial cessions from Spain, in the Ladrões and the Carolines.<sup>55</sup> This led to an agreement on September 10 whereby Spain agreed to sell to Germany the islands of Kusaie, Ponape, and Yap in the Caroline group for a sum to be determined at a later date,<sup>56</sup> although the whole affair was to remain substantiated neither by the published documents from the German archives nor by any evidence of a trustworthy nature available in this country.

<sup>53</sup> See, for example, H. Delbrück, "Politische Korrespondenz", in *Preussische Jahrbücher*, XLIII, 386. Delbrück was one of the few influential editors and writers who was not an Hispanophile during this period in Germany. In the particular article noted, which he headed "Die Niedergang Spaniens, der Katholischen, und der Sieg Amerikas, der Protestantischen Macht", he tried to show how Germans had erred in being carried away by their sympathy for Spain.

<sup>54</sup> This is indicated by the fact that the plan to have Joseph Brückner go to Germany to help create a better feeling was dropped. White himself, after having approved the idea, later wrote the State Department that he believed he could handle the situation and that there was no necessity for sending an unofficial envoy. This view was shared by the department, which cabled White that no steps had been taken to send Brückner for the occasion was "much less urgent".

<sup>55</sup> Richthofen to Radowitz, Aug. 13, *Die Grosse Politik*, XV, 74-75.

<sup>56</sup> The terms of the agreement are in a letter from Derenthall to Wilhelm II., Sept. 12, *Die Grosse Politik*, XV, 76-77. The proviso read: "Toutefois, pour

secret until definitive terms should be made; moreover the whole transaction was made dependent on the decision of the Paris conference on the subject of the Philippines.

While the peace conference was in session, Count Münster, German ambassador to France, was instructed to follow carefully and report the progress of negotiations, "especially with reference to the Philippine question";<sup>57</sup> but his government would avoid anything which would leave with Spaniards or Americans the impression that Germany had any special interest in the matter. When Münster at Paris and Richthofen in Berlin were approached by the respective Spanish ambassadors to find out whether the Kaiser's government could not help to repress the "ever-growing covetousness" of the Americans, no comfort was given. Münster could truthfully say that he had no instructions, and Richthofen that it must be seen that as soon as Germany showed special interest in some particular issue suspicion and hostility would be awakened in the American delegation.<sup>58</sup> Nor was any more support forthcoming when, on instructions from Washington, the American commission demanded the cession of the whole Philippine and Sulu groups.<sup>59</sup>

One further incident may be added to demonstrate that, with conditions as they were, the German government did not intend to take any action which could arouse American resentment. After the ultimatum had been given to the Spanish commissioners, with its demand for the evacuation of Cuba, the cession of Porto Rico, the Philippines, the Sulu islands, and Guam in the Ladrões, Münster was directed to inform Reid that after Spain Germany had the strongest claim to the Sulu group, but if the United States placed no obstacle in the way of Germany's acquisition of the Carolines, the Pelew Islands, and the Ladrões with the exception of Guam, then

l'accord définitif sur la cession des îles susdites, il faudrait attendre la situation qui serait décidée à la conférence de Paris relativement à la souveraineté de l'Espagne sur l'archipel des Philippines." See also Royal Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, II. 244.

<sup>57</sup> Richthofen to Münster (Konzept von der Hand des Vortragenden Rats Grafen von Pourtalès), Oct. 22, 1898, *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 77-78.

<sup>58</sup> Münster to Foreign Office, Oct. 29, and Richthofen to Münster, Nov. 2, *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 78-80. See Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, II. 244 ff., for the impression made by Count Münster and Reid's views of what lay behind the interest he evinced.

<sup>59</sup> Seefried telegraphed Prince von Hohenlohe from Madrid on Nov. 5 about the demands. Spain was powerless to resist, hence the only hope lay in intervention by the powers under the leadership of Germany and Russia. On the margin of the despatch the emperor wrote, "Das fehlte noch!" *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 80-81.



Germany would waive any claim to the Sulus in return for a coaling-station on one of them.<sup>60</sup> It was on this basis that the two countries came to an agreement.<sup>61</sup>

LESTER BURRELL SHIPPEE.

<sup>60</sup> Nov. 21, *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 82-83.

<sup>61</sup> See Holleben's telegram to the Foreign Office, Dec. 31, *Die Grosse Politik*, XV. 96-97. The story of how Germany carried through her negotiations with Spain for the islands, and the momentary check the understanding was subjected to in respect to Kusaie, which at first appeared the most satisfactory location for a cable-station on a line from San Francisco to Manila, have no place in this sketch.

## DOCUMENTS

### 1. Talleyrand and Jaudenes, 1795.

PHOTOSTATS of the following documents, from the Archivo Histórico Nacional at Madrid, were brought to the editor by Professor Samuel F. Bemis, of the George Washington University, who came upon them while studying there the history of the diplomatic relations between the United States and Spain. It is not claimed that they are of the highest historical significance, since the transaction to which they relate came to no important results, but they furnish a curious and interesting illustration of Talleyrand and of his stay in the United States.

The documents consist, it will be seen, of a despatch, dated January 17, 1795, from Josef de Jaudenes, Spanish envoy to the United States,<sup>1</sup> to his minister of foreign affairs, the too-celebrated Godoy, at that time known as the Duque de la Alcudia; of a translation, from French (it is to be presumed) into Spanish, of some information furnished Jaudenes by his Dutch colleague in Philadelphia; of another despatch of Jaudenes to Alcudia, dated November 14, 1795; of a translation, from English into Spanish, of what is described as the English Cabinet's plan for an attack on Spanish America in 1790; and of marginal comments on the two despatches, in the handwriting of Godoy.

Talleyrand, it will be remembered, went from Paris to London in January, 1792, and remained there, with occasional visits to Paris, until February or March, 1794, when he was compelled under the provisions of the Alien Act to leave Great Britain, and sail to the United States.<sup>2</sup> He arrived in Philadelphia on May 22, 1794, went

<sup>1</sup> The *Historical Register of the Department of State* lists him as simply chargé d'affaires, at first jointly with Viar, then solely, but he was raised late in 1794 to the rank of envoy extraordinary. *Correspondence of the French Ministers*, ed. Turner, *Annual Report of Am. Hist. Assoc.*, 1903, II. 530. He had been presented to the President July 20, 1791 (Baker, *Washington after the Revolution*, p. 227); his functions came to an end about May, 1796. The name would now be spelled Jaudenes, being accented on the first syllable.

<sup>2</sup> Pallain, *La Mission de Talleyrand à Londres en 1792*, *passim*. Professor J. Holland Rose, "Protest of Talleyrand against his Expulsion from England, 1 Jan. 1793", in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXI. 330-332, is much in error in saying that he was expelled early in that year. It is true that the provisions of the Alien Act came into force in the closing days of 1792, but they did not require his immediate expulsion, nor does he protest against that form of action; various letters show that he remained in England throughout the year 1793, and he did not embark till February, nor finally sail from England till March, 1794.

to New York a month later, returned to Philadelphia November 16, after a month's travel in New York state, remained there till April 24, 1795, and after his travels in New England was in Philadelphia again from December 5, 1795 (except for a visit to the Federal City) till June 13, 1796, when he embarked for Europe.<sup>3</sup>

Talleyrand was certainly in reduced circumstances when he arrived in the United States. Cut off from his revenues, he had been obliged in London to sell his library.<sup>4</sup> In America he eagerly endeavored to gain money by speculations in land. In Philadelphia, it is plain from the journal of his friend Moreau de St. Méry, he lived in a very small way. In these documents we see him trying to alleviate his poverty by selling to the Spanish envoy, when Spain was at war with France, what he declared to be the plan which the British Cabinet had formed, and proposed to France, in 1790, for an attack on Spanish America at the time of the great armament made on occasion of the Nootka Sound controversy. For this document, acquired somehow during his residence in London, he at first asked 3500 pounds sterling; finally he sold it to Jaudenes for \$8000. Jaudenes congratulates himself upon his bargain. Godoy, who on first hearing of the plan approved its purchase if it could be obtained at a moderate price, philosophically concludes later, when he has received it, that the purchase had been a waste of money. It was no longer so useful, peace having meantime been made with France; the envoy should of course be reimbursed, the plan filed for future reference.

Two points call for comment. First, it will be observed that Talleyrand represents the British negotiators of 1790 as desiring to persuade the French government to make common cause with Great Britain against Spain. In that summer Talleyrand was not yet a member of the National Assembly's committee on foreign affairs. Nothing in the *Despatches of Earl Gower* sustains his statements. We do not know all that we should like to know about the missions of Hugh Elliot and W. A. Miles. Miles would have liked to bring about an alliance between Great Britain and France,<sup>5</sup> but neither in his published correspondence, nor in the letters which passed between Pitt and Elliot and are printed by Stanhope,<sup>6</sup> nor in the extracts which Professor Rose prints from the Chatham Papers,<sup>7</sup> nor

<sup>3</sup> Moreau de St. Méry, *Voyage aux États-Unis de l'Amérique*, ed. Mims, pp. 102, 139, 192, 197, 217, 223.

<sup>4</sup> *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXI. 332.

<sup>5</sup> *Correspondence of William Augustus Miles during the French Revolution*, I. 41-49, 162, 171-181.

<sup>6</sup> *Life of Pitt*, II. 56-61.

<sup>7</sup> *William Pitt and National Revival*, pp. 579-581.

in Gouverneur Morris's record of his conversation with Elliot in 1797,<sup>8</sup> is any evidence to be found of any such expectation on Pitt's part. Plainly, if France would not join Spain in attacking England, Pitt would be satisfied; and Montmorin would not join, because placed as he was he could not.<sup>9</sup> The reader of Dr. Manning's careful and authoritative account of the Nootka Sound affair<sup>10</sup> will hardly be persuaded that the British ministry could in the existing state of France have cherished such hopes.

More important is the question, whether this plan which the ex-bishop of Autun sold to the Spanish envoy was really that which the British Cabinet had entertained in 1790. It is hard to be perfectly confident on this point, but the weight of evidence would certainly incline us to believe that the main attack of the British forces would have been upon some of the Spanish possessions around the Caribbean Sea, rather than upon Montevideo and Buenos Aires. Sir Home Popham stated, some years later, that Sir Archibald Campbell expected to have the command of an expedition against Spanish America in 1790,<sup>11</sup> and Campbell's plans, we know, were against New Orleans and the Gulf.<sup>12</sup> In October, before the news of the adjustment of the dispute reached England, a squadron was despatched to the West Indies, to rendezvous at Barbados.<sup>13</sup> Troops were to be moved from Ireland to Jamaica.<sup>14</sup> Miranda's plans, to which we know that Pitt gave careful heed, are judged by Professor Robertson to have been directed, naturally, against the northern coasts of South America.<sup>15</sup> Miranda left with Pitt, at Pitt's request, "the Plan and defenses of the Havana".<sup>16</sup> In the Chatham Manuscripts at the Public Record Office, bundle 345, there is, Professor Turner tells us, a long, unsigned memorandum addressed to Pitt in 1803 by an officer, who states that in 1790 there was to have been a large expedition against Spanish America, under the command of Campbell, who had then consulted the writer. Co-operation from India, against the west coast of South America, was included in the

<sup>8</sup> *Diary and Letters*, II. 256.

<sup>9</sup> W. S. Robertson, "Francisco de Miranda", in *Annual Report of Am. Hist. Assoc.*, 1907, I. 281, note f, Montmorin to Floridablanca, from Archivo Histórico Nacional.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*, 1904, especially pp. 424-431.

<sup>11</sup> Castlereagh, *Correspondence*, VII. 289.

<sup>12</sup> Campbell to Pitt, Oct. 28, 1790, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, VII. 716.

<sup>13</sup> Robertson, *ubi supra*, p. 227; Manning, *ubi supra*, p. 385, quoting the rare *Narrative of the Negotiations*, privately printed for George III.

<sup>14</sup> *Dropmore Manuscripts*, I. 582.

<sup>15</sup> P. 276.

<sup>16</sup> *Am. Hist. Rev.*, VII. 713.

scheme.<sup>17</sup> [A transcript received from London as we go to press indicates that, according to the memory of the writer (probably Sir Home Popham), the attack was to be made in the Caribbean region.]

All things considered, it is difficult to resist the conviction that what the astute ex-bishop sold to the Spanish envoy was not what he declared it to be. It is indeed possible that he thought it to be such, but if we should try thus to vindicate his honesty, we could do it only at the expense of his patriotism.

Moreau de St. Méry declares of his relations with Talleyrand at Philadelphia, "Nous nous ouvrons nos cœurs, nous en épanchons les sentimens, et nos pensées les plus intimes devenaient communes à l'un et à l'autre".<sup>18</sup> But it does not appear from any indication in his journal that Talleyrand told him about the eight thousand Spanish dollars.

I.<sup>19</sup>

Duplicado.

Num'o 276.

Ex'mo Señor.

Muy Señor mío: Habiendo adquirido noticia de hallarse en poder de Monsieur Talleyrand Perigord (que reside en esta Capital actualmente) el plan que se formó por el Gavinete de San James contra las Posesiones de S. M. en America (y acerca del qual tuve la honrra de insinuar al Rey algunas especies en mi oficio num'o 122) me he valido del Ministro de Holanda con quien corre el mencionado Perigord con la mayor estrechez<sup>20</sup> para que obtuviese del citado con la sagacidad que requiere el caso quantos informes pudiese sobre el particular.

A consecuencia me ha entregado el Ministro de Holanda un apunte de que tengo la honrra de pasar á V. E. adjunta su Traducccion.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, VII, 716. Manning, p. 385, citing *Narrative of the Negotiations*. A. M. Storer, *Auckland Correspondence*, II, 373, indicates that the general expectation in naval circles was of a descent on Mexico. Miller, consul at Charleston, indicates Florida; *Am. Hist. Rev.*, VII, 721-723. The apprehensions of Washington and his Cabinet, as to New Orleans, are known from their consultations recorded by Dr. W. C. Ford in *The United States and Spain in 1790*.

<sup>18</sup> *Voyage*, p. 223.

<sup>19</sup> All these documents are in A. H. N., Estado, leg. 3896.

<sup>20</sup> Franco Petrus van Berckel, minister resident of the Dutch Republic from May, 1789, to September, 1795; often confounded with his predecessor Pieter Johan van Berckel, envoy extraordinary 1783-1788. Talleyrand fell naturally into relations with the Dutch minister, being at the first closely associated with two Dutchmen, for he lived at the house of Théophile Cazenove (Moreau de St. Méry, *Voyage*, p. 194 etc., and *Cazenove Journal*, ed. R. W. Kelsey, pp. x-xiii) and travelled with Jan Huidekoper (Tiffany, *Harm Jan Huidekoper*, p. 25, and Talleyrand, *Memoirs*, Eng. tr., I, 175-176). His estimate of van Berckel, however, was not high, for he writes to Madame de Staël, May 12, 1794, "Le ministre d'Angleterre [Hammond] est d'une classe inférieure; celui d'Hollande vaut un peu mieux"; *Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique*, IV, 211.

El dicho Ministro me presentó en Casa al dicho Monsieur Perigord quien me confirmó quanto indica el apunte, y al mismo tiempo le saqué yo la palabra de que no se desprenderia ni franquearia á nadie el expresado Plan hasta que supiese yo en respuesta si S. M. lo tiene, ó desea tener.

En este ultimo caso debo suponer con fundamento que Monsieur Perygord querrá exigir por el una gran recompensa bien con Empleo en Servicio del Rey, ó bien pecuniaria en consideracion á la indigencia en que ha puesto la revolucion de Francia á este, y otros Personajes.

A este fin suplico á V. E. me comuniqué las ordenes de S. M. sobre si deveré ó no procurar el Plan y hasta donde podré extender mis ofertas de una y otra clase á nombre del Rey.

Me repito á la obediencia de V. E. y ruego á Dios gñe su vida muchos años.

PHILADELPHIA 17. de Enero de 1795.

Ex'mo Señor

B. I. m. de V. E.

Su mas recon'do y obed'te serv'r

JOSEF DE JAUDENES.

Ex'mo Señor Duque de la Alcudia.

[*Endorsement:*] Filadelfia 17. de Enero de 1795. D'n Josef de Jaudenes. Habla de un plan de ataque contra las posesiones Españolas de America; y embia algunos apuntes de él.

[*Marginal comments by Godoy:*]

abril 6 de 95. siempre convendria la adquisicion de este Plan para preservarse si acaso volviera á renovar las quejas que al parecer no existen en el dia, pero considerando que ya el merito a el no seria tan apreciable como en el tiempo en que se temia su verificacion, trate en modo indiferente al medio de adquirirlo y no se excita[?] en dar una gran cantidad, sino en ofrecer el premio debido al merito de los papeles que nos entregue.

## II.

### *Traduccion.*

El Ministro de los Estados de Holanda ha adquirido informe cierto, que los agentes de Francia han hecho algunas aplicaciones á Monsieur de Talleyrand Perigord para obtener un Plan que ellos suponen hallarse en sus manos, y el que contiene la conducta necesaria que se ha de observar para el fin de un ataque contra las Colonias Españolas. El Ministro de los Estados de Holanda informado así, ha conversado sobre el objeto con Monsieur de Talleyrand Perygord con quien se halla muy intimo.

Monsieur de Talleyrand ha declarado que los Agentes de Francia han hecho aplicacion, y finalmente ha conferado á Mr. Van Berckel á sus renovadas instancias *que tiene el plan*. Lo siguiente es la historia verdadera de este Papel.

En el año 1790, al tiempo de las disensiones que se suscitaron sobre el trafico de la Sonda de Nootka, los Yngleses tenian el proyecto de declarar Guerra á España y particularmente el de la emancipacion de las Colonias Españolas. Se hallaban esperanzados que la Francia (entonces en el primer año de su Revolucion) que declaró en todas ocasiones el sistema de emancipar las Colonias, no se opondria á estas miras del Gabinete Britanico, y al contrario que prestaria su asistencia para ello. A conse-

quencia de esto el Ministro Britanico en Paris hizo proposiciones á Monsieur de Montmorin, y á algunos miembros de la Junta Diplomatica particularmente á Monsieur de Mirabeau para concertar medios con la Gran Bretaña para la emancipacion de las Colonias Españolas, lo que devia efectuarse de un golpe de mano.

Le dixo que el Plan estava hecho por Oficiales Britanicos de la primera inteligencia y habilidades, y que a mas tenía ordenes, en caso de aceptarse sus proposiciones, de tomar la opinion de dos Oficiales los mas distinguidos en el servicio de Francia. El asunto quedó suspenso por algunos días, los Miembros de la Junta Diplomatica de la que eran en aquel tiempo Monsieur de Mirabeau, y Talleyrand Perigord,<sup>21</sup> convinieron en oponer las miras de la Gran Bretaña, y de ordenar inmediatamente un Armamento Naval, lo que puso fin al asunto de la Sonda de Nootka.

En el año 1792, Monsieur de Talleyrand Perigord fue embiado por el Rey de Francia á la Gran Bretaña, y entre otras cosas se le mandó que tomase todos los medios para obtener el plan formado en 1790, para el ataque premeditado contra las Colonias Españolas, consiguio este plan con todas sus particularidades, pero á este mismo tiempo el evento del 10. de Agosto sobrevino, quando Monsieur de Talleyrand cesó enteramente de corresponder con aquellos que se hallaban á la Cabeza del Gobierno Frances. Ha llegado despues á los Estados Unidos de America, y ha trahido consigo este Plan con sus otros Papeles. Si el Gavinete de Madrid no lo tiene, es de la mas grande importancia para el en este momento que sepa que este Papel existe, y en que manos se halla.

Es traduccion.

JAUDENES.

### III.

Num'o 318.

Ex'mo Señor:

Muy S'or mio: Careciendo de resp'ta al oficio num'o 276 que tuve la honra de escribir á V. E. relativo al Plan formado por el Gavinete Ynglés contra las Posesiones de S. Mag'd en America, que segun insinué se hallaba en poder de Mr. Talleyrand Perigord, y reflexionando al mismo tiempo la probabilidad de que descontenta aquella Nacion con España por la paz concluida con Francia,<sup>22</sup> premeditará acaso algun golpe, poniendo en execucion el precitado Plan, y hallandome tambien informado de que á Mr. Perigord le ha permitido la Convencion vuelva á Francia,<sup>23</sup> Y ámas, le ha empleado en su Gobierno, me ha parecido muy importante [sa]carle el Plan consabido.

A consecuencia me valí de una oportunidad, (en que me escribió deseando saber si habia tenido respuesta de la Corte sobre el objeto en question) para responderle en la negativa y añadirle, que si gustase insinuarle en quanto estimaba el tal papel y fuese una cosa razonable, tal vez me aventuraria á entrar en negociacion de motu proprio.

En seguida se me presentó y aseguró baxo palabra de honor, que le habia costado tres mil y quinientas libras esterlinas, y que si le daba la

<sup>21</sup> Talleyrand did not become a member of the Comité Diplomatique till Apr. 1, 1791, when he succeeded Mirabeau. *Archives Parlementaires*, XXIV. 630.

<sup>22</sup> Treaty signed at Basel July 22, 1795.

<sup>23</sup> Decree of Sept. 3, which Talleyrand received in November (Moreau, 2 217), and evidently early in that month.



misma cantidad por de pronto, y despues lo mas que me mandare dar mi Corte, si lo quisiese, me lo entregaria.

Le contexté que era demasiada cantidad para tomarla yo sobre mi, y que lo mas que hubiese arriesgado, seria como la mitad de la suma expresada.

Estuvo muy resistente, y me propuso dos ó tres rebaxas hasta que finalmente le pude reducir á que conviniese con ocho mil pesos, que viene á ser la mitad en poca diferencia de lo que pidio; pero me hizo darle palabra de que si la Corte me diese ordenes para obtener el papel, y me prefixase la suma (mucho mayor segun el se lisongeaba por la importancia del plan) hasta que podria extenderme, que le habia de dar el resto.

Concluido el pacto en los terminos que preceden, puso en mis manos el papel, y yo en las suyas una orden sobre el Banco por los ocho mil pesos; de los que le hize dar su recibo que tengo en mi poder.

La utilidad de tener conocimiento de un proyecto de ésta naturaleza, yá sea para las actuales circunstancias, ó para lo venidero, V. E. con su superior talento lo penetrará, y no debo dudar que sea grata á S. Mag'd ésta transaccion, y que se dignará aprobar quanto he practicado, y la suma que he invertido en ello, movido del mas puro zelo de hacer al Rey un servicio que puede ser de grande importancia.

Adjunta tengo la honra de pasar á manos de V. E. traduccion del predicho papel.

Me renuevo á las ordenes de V. E. y ruego á Dios gñe la vida de V. E. muchos años. PHILADELPHIA 14 de Noviembre de 1795.

Ex'mo Señor

B. L. M. de V. E.

Su mas recon'do y obed'te serv'r

JOSEF DE JAUDENES.

Ex'mo S'or Duque de la Alcudia.

[*Endorsement:*] Remite copia de un Proyecto contra Buenos Ayres.

[*Marginal comments by Godoy:*]

Enero 25 de 96. Dinero mal empliado pero que ya no puede reembolsarse si una vista medianamente politica hubiese ojeado el papelote [ ]draria sus grandes defectos y dificultades pero que está hecho el gasto y es necesario pagarlo apruevese á Jaudenes y para lo que convenga remitase á Guerra una copia del proyecto p[rovis]o siempre se encuentra utilidad de lo escrito.

[*Below:*] Se pasó el Duplicado á Guerra en 11 de Febrero 1796.

#### IV.

El Señor de Galvez en un memorial que presentó al Rey de España el año de 1779, le manifiesta la importancia de Buenos Aires, uniendo todas las ventajas procedentes de Chile, la Provincia de Tucuman que es la mas abundante de las Provincias del Perú, y el paso desde el Potosi del que dista cerca de 60 dias de jornada por tierra.

Podemos añadir á esto que el Comercio de Negros para el abastecimiento de las minas pasa por Buenos Ayres así como el de una vasta cantidad de Provisiones, y de la Hierba Paraguay tan esencialmente necesaria para los Yndios.

Aparece entonces que España no puede sufrir mayor pérdida que la interrupcion de aquel Comercio que se hace continuamente por Buenos Ayres y acaso en ninguna parte se le puede hacer mas daño.

Sería de grande ventaja el entablar una Expedicion contra Buenos Aires por la bondad del Clima, que es igual al de las Provincias del Sur de Francia, [y de] las del Norte de España.

La grande abundancia que hay allí de toda suerte de Ganado, y la superabundancia de Pescado que se cojo en el Rio son articulos de la mayor importancia para el refresco y buen tratamiento de una expedicion distante.

Quiza se concederá que una Expedicion bien proyectada, conducida, y efectuada repentinamente apenas dexará de surtir buen efecto en qualquiera parte fuera de Europa, donde por innumerables circunstancias la Disciplina y regularidad de las Colonias nunca se mantiene suficientemente para hacerles capaces de poder resistir un ataque inesperado. Las Colonias Españolas han visto siempre pruebas indubitables de esta opinion.

De esto se saca que el secreto y actividad son los dos requisitos para una Expedicion semejante, y el Plan siguiente ha sido propuesto baxo estos principios.

La Expedicion ha de tener para un objeto declarado la reduccion de Santo Domingo á la obediencia de la Francia, ó de otra Ysla en las del Oeste, como las circunstancias del dia lo hagan mas provable.

La expedicion ha de dexar Francia de suerte que llegue al Rio de la Plata para ultimos de Septiembre, despues de parado el Equinoccio del Otoño (entre ellos de la Primavera.)

La Fuerza empleada debe consistir de seis mil hombres completos, independiente de artilleros, y de tal asistencia como se les pueda dar de la Flota. Estas Tropas han de estar abastecidas con Piezas de Artilleria, instrumentos de Trincheras, Tiendas, sillas para Caballos, y armas para distribuir á los nativos.

Y para impedir quanto sea posible la separacion de la Flota, se ha propuesto reducir el numero de Barcos á tan pocos como sea posible embarcando los Soldados en Barcos grandes espaciosos en lugar de emplear Barcos pequeños que son mas incomodos, y aumenta el riesgo de separacion muy amenudo que es la destruccion del plan mexor formado. La fuerza nombrada puede ser alterada segun las circunstancias procedentes de informes venideros ó las conven[iencias?] lo haga necesario, pero se ha de observar que los Barcos empleados deben ser los que calen poca agua, y tienen mas comodidad segun sus clases diferentes.

#### Fuerza de Mar.

	Marineros	Soldados	
4 Navios de 64 Cañones	300.	400.	1600.
2 Do. de 50 do.	200.	300.	600.
4 Fragatas de 32 do.	150.	200.	800.
4 Do. de 28 do.	150.	100.	400.
6 Navios grandes armados en Guerra }	100.	300.	3000.

Esta fuerza consistiendo de Catorce Barcos de Guerra, y seis Navios grandes armados en Guerra estaria menos expuesta a accidentes y separaciones que un numero de transportes que nunca se pueden tener juntos sin mucha dificultad.

El Comandante en Gefe naturalmente regulará el numero de Gente á cada Barco conforme a las circunstancias de su tamaño y conveniencia. Las quatro Fragatas mas pequeñas que tienen mas Marineros, y menos soldados en proporcion, se intenta sirvar para cruzar, y todo Servicio activo.

Cada uno de los Navios grandes debe tener un bote chato ademas del numero de Botes que se acostumbra de suerte que pueda echar á tierra de cada Barco doscientos cinquenta hombres con la asistencia de los Botes de las Fragatas que formarian de los doce Navios grandes un Cuerpo de tres mil hombres, ó la mitad de la Expedicion al primer desembarque.

A la llegada de la Flota al Cabo Santa Maria se deben embiar las Fragatas á registrar la Bahia de Maldonado, y cortar qualquier Barcos ó Barcas que pueden estar anclados para procurar inteligencia y Pilotos, como tambien para tener el uso de los Barcos para la Navegacion interna del Rio.

La Flota ha de proceder sin perdida de tiempo á Monte Video cuya entrada se conoce desde el mar por una alta montaña al lado izquierdo.

Este parage que esta fortificado ha de ser atacado con vigor, y como su guarnicion se supone no excede nunca de 500 hombres se debe suponer que su defensa no será de mucha continuacion. Este siendo un buen Puerto domina en gran parte la entrada del Rio, y puede ser proprio dexar aquí los Barcos mayores no solamente como Guardia, sino que como el Rio esta lleno de Barcos conforme se va acia arriba puede ser dificultoso, sino peligroso el que procedan mas adelante.

El inmediato Puerto de consecuencia es al mismo lado del Rio San Gabriel y Colonia del Santo Sacramento<sup>24</sup> que domina en gran parte el pasage del Rio Uruguay.

Hay un Barco chato á la entrada de Buenos Aires que impede á los Barcos llegar cerca de la Ciudad, será por tanto necesario que cada uno de los Botes grandes esten provehidos con un Cañon ligero en su proa baxo cuyo fuego se propone que las Tropas desembarquen al Sud Este de la Ciudad cerca de la Boca del Rio pequeño de Matanzas.

Despues de la conquista de Buenos Aires el Puerto que se debe ocupar inmediatamente es Santa Fé, donde será necesario levantar algunos reductos para su defensa; este es el Pasage al Perú y domina al del Parana, y del Rio Salado.

Al mismo tiempo se han de tomar todos los pasos posibles por ambos lados del Rio para conciliar los Nativos que han estado largo tiempo en Guerras con los Españoles, y que se les supone son todavia hostiles en lo interior del Pais de lo que no pueden faltar informes en el mismo parage.

Sino se piensa guardar posesion de Buenos Aires se pueden dexar armas y municiones á los Nativos y la Flota puede proceder á los Mares del Sur, porque aunque no esten mas de tres meses en el Rio de la Plata la sazón será la mas favorable para pasar al Cabo de Hornos y pueden atacar Baldivia, Concepcion ó Valparaiso segun el informe que no pueden dexar de recibir en Buenos Aires.

Se pueden tener informes mas exactos de los Misioneros que han residido en estas Partes del Mundo y de los Portugueses los que hasta el Tratado de 1778<sup>25</sup> posehian el lado del Norte del Rio.

<sup>24</sup> Now called Colonia, in Uruguay.

<sup>25</sup> Treaty of San Ildefonso, Oct. 1, 1777, between Spain and Portugal.

El mexor Mapa que yo se es el de Vloadillo que se gravó en Madrid, pero no se vendió, y se han empezado actualmente al presente un nuevo examen cuyos particulares se han pasado ya al Gravador del Rey en Madrid. Es traduccion.

JAUDENES.

2. *Autobiography of Omar ibn Said, Slave in North Carolina, 1831.*

Most of the slaves who were imported into the American colonies, and into the United States before 1808, were brought from that part of the African coast which lies east of Cape Palmas, or still further south, but a considerable number came from the regions of the Gambia and Senegal rivers. These were mostly Mandingos, but partly Fulas. The Fulas are not precisely negroes, but seem to be a mixture of negro and Berber stock, and have long been devout Mohammedans. Among them, as among the Mandingos, education, to the point of reading the Koran and writing, was not infrequent.<sup>1</sup> Therefore it is not surprising that, among the American slaves, there were a certain number of literate Mohammedans; but there are only a few of whom accounts have appeared in print, and the only instance known to the present editor of an autobiographical sketch from the hand of one of them is that set forth below, from a manuscript in Arabic lent to him by its present possessor, his friend Mr. Howland Wood, curator of the American Numismatic Society, in New York.

The first story of an educated Mohammedan slave in America which has come to the writer's attention is that which is set forth in the rare pamphlet entitled *Some Memoirs of the Life of Job the Son of Solomon the High Priest of Boonda in Africa*.<sup>2</sup> This will be reprinted in one of those volumes of documents illustrating the history of the slave trade which are being prepared for the Carnegie Institution of Washington by Miss Elizabeth Donnan, associate professor in Wellesley College; it suffices here to say that Job, a slave in Maryland in 1731-1733, was, like the writer of the sketch below, a Fula from the kingdom of Futa, in what is now French Senegal, who wrote Arabic and was familiar with the Koran—indeed he could repeat the whole of it.

<sup>1</sup> Mungo Park, who in 1795 travelled in this region, having for some time a local schoolmaster as his companion, describes the status of education. *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa* (London, 1816), I. 468-473. See also Comte Mollien's *Voyage dans l'Intérieur de l'Afrique en 1818* (Paris, 1820), II. 99.

<sup>2</sup> By Thomas Bluett of Maryland (London, 1734). Later portions of his career are narrated by Francis Moore in his *Travels into the Inland Parts of Africa* (London, 1738).

Another educated and originally Mohammedan Fula of whom there is an account in print is a slave called Old Paul, or Lahmen Kebby, of whom the Rev. R. R. Gurley, secretary of the American Colonization Society, reports in 1837, in the *African Repository*,<sup>3</sup> that "more than a year ago" he was preparing to embark at New York for Liberia. The fullest account of him, however, is given in the *Methodist Review* for January, 1864,<sup>4</sup> in an article by Theodore Dwight (1796-1866), who for many years was recording secretary of the American Ethnological Society. Dwight was deeply interested in West Africa, and made special efforts to obtain information from or respecting Mohammedan slaves in the United States. "But there are insuperable difficulties in the way in slave countries, . . . which quite discouraged a gentleman who made exertions in the South some years since, and compelled him to abandon the undertaking in despair, although he had resided in Africa, and had both the taste and the ability necessary to success."<sup>5</sup> Old Paul, he says, "was liberated in 1835, after being about forty years a slave in South Carolina, Alabama, and other southern states, and spent about a year in New York, under the care of the Colonization Society, while waiting for a vessel to take him back to his native country". Dwight had many talks with him, took copious notes of his information about Senegambia, and printed three or four pages from them in the proceedings of the American Lyceum in 1836.<sup>6</sup> Paul came from Futa, as Job and Omar did. "Paul was a schoolmaster in Footah, after pursuing a long course of preparatory studies, and said that he had an aunt who was much more learned than himself, and eminent for her superior acquirements and for her skill in teaching. Schools, he said, were generally established through the country, provision being made by law for educating children of all classes, the poor being taught gratuitously." He gave Dwight an account of their manuscript books, and a list of some thirty that were in his mother tongue (Sarakullé) though written in Arabic characters.

Finally, the early *Transactions* of the American Ethnological Society<sup>7</sup> show that there was read, in one of their meetings in 1843, "A letter from J. Hamilton Couper, Esq., of Georgia, to William B. Hodgson, giving an account of an aged Foulah slave now living in that State, together with his African reminiscences".

<sup>3</sup> XIII. 204.

<sup>4</sup> "Condition and Character of Negroes in Africa", *Methodist Review*, XLVI. 77-90, especially pp. 80-84.

<sup>5</sup> This means William B. Hodgson, of Georgia, who had been U. S. consul in Tunis for some years.

<sup>6</sup> This periodical, for this year, the editor has not found.

<sup>7</sup> I. xi.

The manuscript translated below is written, in good Arabic script, on some fifteen pages of quarto paper, and is inscribed in English as having been "Written by himself in 1831 and sent to Old Paul, or Lahmen Kebby, in New York, in 1836, Presented to Theodore Dwight by Paul" in that same year, and translated into English in 1848 by Alexander I. Cotheal, who for many years was treasurer of the Ethnological Society and was a fancier of Arabic manuscripts.<sup>8</sup> In February, 1863, the *Bulletin* of the society states, "Another Arabic MS. was again exhibited by the Recording Secretary, written in 1836 [*sic*], by the remarkable old slave Morro [Omar], in Fayetteville, N. C., which contains a connected narrative of the writer's life, according to a translation made by Mr. Cotheal, and formerly read to the society." In 1864 Dwight published in his article in the *Methodist Review* some extracts from that quite imperfect translation.<sup>9</sup> Some time after this he obtained a better version from Rev. Isaac Bird (1793-1876) of Hartford, who had been for a dozen years (1823-1835) a missionary in Syria,<sup>10</sup> and had a good knowledge of Arabic. It is this translation, slightly revised through the kindness of Dr. F. M. Moussa, secretary of the Egyptian Legation in Washington, which is here presented. The manuscript and both translations were given to Mr. Wood by a friend, who bought them at an auction.

Besides what Omar tells of his life, some additional facts may be found in an article in the New York *Observer* of January 8, 1863, entitled "Meroh, a Native African", and signed "A Wayfaring Man". The writer, who was the Rev. William S. Plumer (1802-1880),<sup>11</sup> Presbyterian pastor in Allegheny and professor in the Western Theological Seminary 1854-1862, says that he first met the man in Wilmington, North Carolina, in 1826, and had seen him once or twice since, and that he was born about 1770 on the banks of the Senegal.

I write his name Meroh. It was originally Umeroh. Some write it Moro; and some put it in the French form Moreau. It is commonly pronounced as if spelled Moro.<sup>12</sup> Meroh's father in Africa was a man of considerable wealth. He brought up his children delicately. Meroh's fingers are rather effeminate. They are very well tapered. His whole person and gait bear marks of considerable refinement. At about five

<sup>8</sup> See the account of his library in James Wynne, *Private Libraries of New York*, pp. 161-172.

<sup>9</sup> XLVI. 88.

<sup>10</sup> H. H. Jessup, *Fifty-three Years in Syria*, pp. 42-46.

<sup>11</sup> Letter of Mr. Bird, among the manuscripts.

<sup>12</sup> Mr. Bird says, in the letter just mentioned, "The name Moro is doubtless the same as Amrou or Omar, the final *o* or *u* being only a vowel point".

years of age he lost his father, in one of those bloody wars that are almost constantly raging in Africa. Very soon thereafter he was taken by an uncle to the capital of the tribe. Here he learned and afterward taught Arabic, especially some prayers used by Mahomedans. He also learned some rules of arithmetic, and many of the forms of business. When a young man he became a dealer in the merchandise of the country, chiefly consisting in cotton cloths.

Mr. Plumer adds that when "Meroh" first landed in Charleston (which, it will be observed, was apparently in 1807, the last year in which importations of slaves were legal) he was sold to a citizen of that city who treated him with great kindness, but soon died. He mentions that when confined in the Cumberland County jail, the poor man, finding some coals in the ashes, wrote in Arabic on the walls what were understood to be appeals for succor; that when he came to General Owen's family he was at first a staunch Mohammedan and kept Ramadan; that through the kindness of his friends an English version of the Koran was procured for him, and was read to him, along with the Bible, but that gradually he became a Christian; that he was baptized and received into the Presbyterian Church at Fayetteville by the Rev. Dr. Snodgrass (which fixes the date of such reception to 1810-1822), but later was transferred to a Wilmington church.

In a letter from Augusta, Georgia, May 21, 1837, Rev. R. R. Gurley reports,<sup>13</sup> "In the respected family of General Owen of Wilmington I became acquainted with Moro or Omora, a Foulah by birth, educated a Mahometan and who, long after he came in slavery to this country, retained a devoted attachment to the faith of his fathers, and deemed a copy of the Koran in Arabic . . . his richest treasure". He adds that, when Paul was about to embark from New York for Liberia, Moro or Omar "corresponded with him and presented him with one of his two copies of the Bible in that language". Omar speaks of them, in a letter from which Gurley quotes, as "two Arabic Bibles, procured for me by my good Christian friends", meaning doubtless the Owens. The copy which he retained, an Arabic Bible of the edition of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1811, is now in the Library of Davidson College, in Charlotte County, North Carolina, well worn, and bearing the inscription, "Old Uncle Moreau's Arabick Bible, Presented to the Williams Missionary Association, Davidson College, by Mrs. Ellen Guion, Charlotte, N. C., April, 1871".<sup>14</sup> Mrs. Guion was a daughter of Governor John Owen.

<sup>13</sup> *African Repository*, XIII. 203-204.

<sup>14</sup> Letter of the librarian, Miss Cornelia Shaw.



Miss Anna Guion Stith, of Wilmington, a connection of the Owen family, recalls from tradition that when Omar, arrested at Fayetteville as a vagrant, and put in jail and advertised for sale as a slave, had "astonished the natives" by writing in Arabic on the walls, General James Owen, brother of Governor John Owen, out of curiosity, when visiting Fayetteville, went to the jail to see this remarkable man, became interested, and purchased him, carrying him to his country home, "Milton", in Bladen County, where he enjoyed life, without being treated as a slave, had a seat by himself in the country church, etc.; he spent his later years mostly at "Owen Hill", Governor Owen's estate, where he occupied his own home in the yard, and had his meals prepared by the Owens' cook and brought in by a little negro, and where he was buried. He lived till after the Civil War. A daguerreotype of him is in the possession of Miss Mary Owen Graham, of Charlotte, North Carolina, who also has (inaccessible at present) some of his Arabic manuscripts, and who has kindly written the editor at length concerning him.

The earlier pages of the manuscript are occupied with quotations from the Koran which Omar remembered, and these might be omitted as not autobiographical, and are indeed separated from what follows by blank pages; but it has been thought best to print the whole. These remembrances from the past were a part of the man, and help to give the narrative greater completeness as a "human document" of unusual and indeed somewhat pathetic interest.

In the name of God, the merciful the gracious.—God grant his blessing upon our Prophet Mohammed. Blessed be He in whose hands is the kingdom and who is Almighty; who created death and life that he might test you; for he is exalted; he is the forgiver (of sins), who created seven heavens one above the other. Do you discern anything trifling in creation? Bring back your thoughts. Do you see anything worthless? Recall your vision in earnest. Turn your eye inward for it is diseased. God has adorned the heavens and the world with lamps, and has made us missiles for the devils, and given us for them a grievous punishment, and to those who have disbelieved their Lord, the punishment of hell and pains of body. Whoever associates with them shall hear a boiling caldron, and what is cast therein may fitly represent those who suffer under the anger of God.—Ask them if a prophet has not been sent unto them. They say, "Yes; a prophet has come to us, but we have lied to him." We said, "God has not sent us down anything, and you are in grievous error." They say, "If we had listened and been wise we should not now have been suffering the punishment of the Omniscient." So they confess they have sinned in destroying the followers of the Omniscient. Those who fear their Lord and profess his name, they receive pardon and great honor. Guard your words, (ye wicked), make it known that God is all-wise in all his manifestations. Do you not know from the creation that God is full of skill? that He has made for you the way of error, and you have

walked therein, and have chosen to live upon what your god Nasûr has furnished you? Believe on Him who dwells in heaven, who has fitted the earth to be your support and it shall give you food. Believe on Him who dwells in Heaven, who has sent you a prophet, and you shall understand what a teacher (He has sent you). Those that were before them deceived them (in regard to their prophet). And how came they to reject him? Did they not see in the heavens above them, how the fowls of the air receive with pleasure that which is sent them? God looks after all. Believe ye: it is He who supplies your wants, that you may take his gifts and enjoy them, and take great pleasure in them. And now will you go on in error, or walk in the path of righteousness. Say to them, "He who regards you with care, and who has made for you the heavens and the earth and gives you prosperity, Him you think little of. This is He that planted you in the earth, and to whom you are soon to be gathered." But they say, "If you are men of truth, tell us when shall this promise be fulfilled?" Say to them, "Does not God know? and am not I an evident Prophet?" When those who disbelieve shall see the things draw near before their faces, it shall then be told them, "These are the things about which you made inquiry." Have you seen that God has destroyed me or those with me? or rather that He has shewn us mercy? And who will defend the unbeliever from a miserable punishment? Say, "Knowledge is from God." Say; "Have you not seen that your water has become impure? Who will bring you fresh water from the fountain?"

O Sheikh Hunter,<sup>15</sup> I cannot write my life because I have forgotten much of my own language, as well as of the Arabic. Do not be hard upon me, my brother.—To God let many thanks be paid for his great mercy and goodness.

In the name of God, the Gracious, the Merciful.—Thanks be to God, supreme in goodness and kindness and grace, and who is worthy of all honor, who created all things for his service, even man's power of action and of speech.

From Omar to Sheikh Hunter.

You asked me to write my life. I am not able to do this because I have much forgotten my own, as well as the Arabic language. Neither can I write very grammatically or according to the true idiom. And so, my brother, I beg you, in God's name, not to blame me, for I am a man of weak eyes, and of a weak body.

My name is Omar ibn Seid. My birthplace was Fut Tûr,<sup>16</sup> between the two rivers. I sought knowledge under the instruction of a Sheikh called Mohammed Seid, my own brother, and Sheikh Soleiman Kembeh, and Sheikh Gabriel Abdal. I continued my studies twenty-five years, and

<sup>15</sup> The address to some one named Hunter remains obscure. The document, for whomever written in 1831, was sent to Paul in 1836. Omar's own language was probably Fula.

<sup>16</sup> Futa Toro, one of the Fula states of that time, now a part of French Senegal. A description of it as it was at a time not much later than that at which Omar left it can be found in Comte Mollien's *Voyage dans l'Intérieur de l'Afrique*, I. 269-297.

then returned to my home where I remained six years. Then there came to our place a large army, who killed many men, and took me, and brought me to the great sea, and sold me into the hands of the Christians, who bound me and sent me on board a great ship and we sailed upon the great sea a month and a half, when we came to a place called Charleston in the Christian language. There they sold me to a small, weak, and wicked man, called Johnson, a complete infidel, who had no fear of God at all. Now I am a small man, and unable to do hard work so I fled from the hand of Johnson and after a month came to a place called Fayd-il.<sup>17</sup> There I saw some great houses (churches). On the new moon I went into a church to pray. A lad saw me and rode off to the place of his father and informed him that he had seen a black man in the church. A man named Handah (Hunter?) and another man with him on horseback, came attended by a troop of dogs. They took me and made me go with them twelve miles to a place called Fayd-il, where they put me into a great house from which I could not go out. I continued in the great house (which, in the Christian language, they called *jail*) sixteen days and nights. One Friday the jailor came and opened the door of the house and I saw a great many men, all Christians, some of whom called out to me, "What is your name? Is it Omar or Seid?" I did not understand their Christian language. A man called Bob Mumford<sup>18</sup> took me and led me out of the jail, and I was very well pleased to go with them to their place. I stayed at Mumford's four days and nights, and then a man named Jim Owen,<sup>19</sup> son-in-law of Mumford, having married his daughter Betsey, asked me if I was willing to go to a place called Bladen.<sup>20</sup> I said, Yes, I was willing. I went with them and have remained in the place of Jim Owen until now.

Before [after?] I came into the hand of Gen. Owen a man by the name of Mitchell came to buy me. He asked me if I were willing to go to Charleston City. I said "No, no, no, no, no, no, no, I not willing to go to Charleston. I stay in the hand of Jim Owen."

O ye people of North Carolina, O ye people of S. Carolina, O ye people of America all of you; have you among you any two such men as Jim Owen and John Owen?<sup>21</sup> These men are good men. What food they eat they give to me to eat. As they clothe themselves they clothe me. They permit me to read the gospel of God, our Lord, and Saviour, and King; who regulates all our circumstances, our health and wealth, and who bestows his mercies willingly, not by constraint. According to power I open my heart, as to a great light, to receive the true way, the way of the Lord Jesus the Messiah.

Before I came to the Christian country, my religion was the religion of "Mohammed, the Apostle of God—may God have mercy upon him and give him peace." I walked to the mosque before day-break, washed my

<sup>17</sup> Fayetteville.

<sup>18</sup> Sheriff of Cumberland County, of which Fayetteville is the county seat.

<sup>19</sup> James Owen (1784-1865), M. C. from North Carolina 1817-1819, and afterward president of the Wilmington and Raleigh Railroad and major-general of militia.

<sup>20</sup> Bladen County, N. C.

<sup>21</sup> John Owen (1787-1841), brother of the preceding, governor of North Carolina from December, 1828, to December, 1830.

face and head and hands and feet. I prayed at noon, prayed in the afternoon, prayed at sunset, prayed in the evening. I gave alms every year, gold, silver, seeds, cattle, sheep, goats, rice, wheat, and barley. I gave tithes of all the above-named things. I went every year to the holy war against the infidels. I went on pilgrimage to Mecca, as all did who were able.—My father had six sons and five daughters, and my mother had three sons and one daughter. When I left my country I was thirty-seven years old; I have been in the country of the Christians twenty-four years.—Written A. D. 1831.

O ye people of North Carolina, O ye people of South Carolina, O all ye people of America—

The first son of Jim Owen is called Thomas,<sup>22</sup> and his sister is called Masa-jein (Martha Jane?). This is an excellent family.

Tom Owen and Nell Owen have two sons and a daughter. The first son is called Jim and the second John. The daughter is named Melissa.

Seid Jim Owen and his wife Betsey have two sons and five daughters. Their names are Tom, and John, and Mercy, Miriam, Sophia, Margaret and Eliza. This family is a very nice family. The wife of John Owen is called Lucy and an excellent wife she is. She had five children. Three of them died and two are still living.

O ye Americans, ye people of North Carolina—have you, have you, have you, have you among you a family like this family, having so much love to God as they?

Formerly I, Omar, loved to read the book of the Koran the famous. General Jim Owen and his wife used to read the gospel, and they read it to me very much,—the gospel of God, our Lord, our Creator, our King. He that orders all our circumstances, health and wealth, willingly, not constrainedly, according to his power.—Open thou my heart to the gospel, to the way of uprightness.—Thanks to the Lord of all worlds, thanks in abundance. He is plenteous in mercy and abundant in goodness.

For the law was given by Moses but grace and truth were by Jesus the Messiah.

When I was a Mohammedan I prayed thus: "Thanks be to God, Lord of all worlds, the merciful the gracious, Lord of the day of Judgment, thee we serve, on thee we call for help. Direct us in the right way, the way of those on whom thou hast had mercy, with whom thou hast not been angry and who walk not in error. Amen."—But now I pray "Our Father", etc., in the words of our Lord Jesus the Messiah.

I reside in this our country by reason of great necessity. Wicked men took me by violence and sold me to the Christians. We sailed a month and a half on the great sea to the place called Charleston in the Christian land. I fell into the hands of a small, weak and wicked man, who feared not God at all, nor did he read (the gospel) at all nor pray.

<sup>22</sup> According to Miss Graham's recollection, the genealogical details which Omar here inserts are nearly though not quite correct, assuming that the "Tom Owen and Nell Owen" of whom he speaks in the next paragraph were Colonel Thomas Owen of Revolutionary days and his wife Eleanor Porterfield Owen, father and mother of the two brothers with whom his later years were so pleasantly spent.

I was afraid to remain with a man so depraved and who committed so many crimes and I ran away. After a month our Lord God brought me forward to the hand of a good man, who fears God, and loves to do good, and whose name is Jim Owen and whose brother is called Col. John Owen. These are two excellent men.—I am residing in Bladen County.

I continue in the hand of Jim Owen who never beats me, nor scolds me. I neither go hungry nor naked, and I have no hard work to do. I am not able to do hard work for I am a small man and feeble. During the last twenty years I have known no want in the hand of Jim Owen.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

### GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

*Fossil Man in Spain.* By HUGO OBERMAIER, Professor of Prehistoric Archaeology at the University of Madrid. With an Introduction by HENRY FAIRFIELD OSBORN, President of the American Museum of Natural History. (New Haven: published for the Hispanic Society of America by the Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1924. Pp. xxviii, 495. \$5.00.)

In his appreciative and instructive introduction Professor Osborn points out not only the qualifications of the well-known author, but also the importance of the prehistory of Spain to the students of early man and even to those of the historic Spanish people. He adds a useful outline of the seeming five prehistoric with the five main historic invasions of the Peninsula.

The book is essentially archaeological, dealing but incidentally with the physical man. Moreover, though its main object is the prehistory of Spain, a considerable part of the work is devoted to man's antiquity in general, which has introduced, particularly in connection with the Americas, a certain amount of matter which is not always of the strength of the remainder and could to advantage have been treated separately.

The scope of the book may be seen from the list of the contents: Tertiary Man and the Problem of the Eoliths; the Glacial Epoch; Plants and Animals of the Glacial Epoch; Early Palaeolithic Industries; Late Palaeolithic Industries; the Iberian Peninsula during the Glacial Epoch; Palaeolithic Art; Geologic Chronology of Palaeolithic Industries in Europe; Fossil Man; Transition from Palaeolithic to Neolithic; Notes and Bibliography.

The most original and valuable parts are the chapters on the Iberian peninsula (ch. VI. and part of ch. VII.), supplemented with extensive bibliography. In these sections the author deals with every palaeolithic find of importance in Spain up to 1922, a number of which are made known, or made known in a broader way, for the first time. Individually, outside of the Gibraltar skull, none of these finds as yet is of capital importance, but the cumulative evidence is of much weight.

In relation to early man in general, the author opposes the acceptance of Tertiary "eoliths" as the work of man. "This does not mean that pre-Palaeolithic eoliths shaped by the hand of man do not exist. . . . But so far, the result of careful and unprejudiced investigation goes no further than to prove that forces purely dynamic and geologic are sufficient satisfactorily to explain the natural and accidental formation of 'eoliths'. Consequently, the existence of Tertiary man cannot be proved as yet by any such evidence."

The author's conclusions as to the Glacial epoch, which is the epoch of Man, may well be quoted more in full. He adheres to the four glaciations of Penck and Brückner, the causes of which are not yet clear. But the cold was not extreme. "A lowering of the present average annual temperature from 6° to 7° C. would in itself be sufficient, without allowing for any increase in humidity, to produce in our own times another glacial epoch on the same scale and with the same regional differences that characterized the Glacial Epoch." Also judging from present-day observations on glaciated areas, "it is very probable that the Pleistocene glaciations represent a phenomenon absolutely general in effect, which influenced our entire planet equally, without causing successive alternations of glaciation between the two hemispheres". Of the glacial fauna, "the cave bear, cave hyena, cave lion, giant deer, mammoth, and woolly rhinoceros did not disappear until the Post-glacial Stage, and disappeared earlier in the south than in the north. In no case was Pleistocene man the 'destroyer' of this interesting fauna".

As to early man in Spain,

Day by day it becomes clearer that Spain is destined to play a most interesting rôle in all that concerns the study of Palæolithic Man. As regards number and riches, its industrial deposits are in no respect inferior to those of France. Its importance increases as we realize the fact that the Iberian Peninsula was a highway and connecting link between two continents. . . . These facts give ground for the hope that future research here may achieve results of the highest importance, such as have already been attained in the domain of Palæolithic Art, where Spain—with her incomparable treasures in this field—is well assured of a preëminent place in Europe.

About chronology the author is cautious:

the chronologic systems so far proposed are no more than provisional attempts, the value of which will be determined by the science of the future. But at least we may safely assert that it has been demonstrated beyond question that the age of primitive man in Europe goes back to the time of the Etruscan rhinoceros and trogontherian mammoth (*Rhinoceros etruscus*, *Elephas trogontherii*)—that is to say, to the Second Interglacial Stage. According to the present author's classification this would correspond to the Middle Pleistocene—according to the earlier school, to the Early Pleistocene—and there can be no doubt that the absolute time elapsed comprises a period of very long duration.

Chapter IX., 43 pages, is devoted to brief but serviceable notes on the many finds of skeletal remains of early man. Among the illustrations there is a very good new view of the lower jaw of Bañolas. It is in this chapter that Dr. Obermaier treats also of early man in America, a subject with which, regrettably, he is not personally acquainted and in connection with which he allows himself to make statements which can not but mar somewhat the effect of the rest of his deserving work. After enumerating the various well-known finds of Ameghino and others to



which some authors have attributed a Pleistocene and even greater antiquity, he is rather hard on

A. Hrdlička, the anthropologist, and Bailey Willis, the geologist, both [of whom] consider that such documents are of very doubtful age, that the geologic and stratigraphic conditions of discovery are in no case entirely free from objections, and, moreover, that the skeletal remains differ in no respect from the typical *Homo sapiens* of the present day.

Our own personal opinion is that the criticisms of these two authorities err on the side of an exaggerated scepticism, and we feel persuaded that later explorations made in America will go to rehabilitate at least the greater part of the list of discoveries by R. Lehmann-Nitsche and others.

However this should not prejudice the reader against the book, which contains much of value.

ALÉŠ HRDLIČKA.

*History and Literature of Christianity from Tertullian to Boethius.*

By PIERRE DE LABRIOLLE, Professor at the Faculté des Lettres, Poitiers. Translated from the French by Herbert Wilson. [The History of Civilization, edited by C. K. Ogden, vol. V.] (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1925. Pp. xxiii, 555. \$7.50.)

THE publishers of this work present it as the "History and Literature of Christianity from Tertullian to Boethius". Inasmuch as the work omits entirely the more extensive and, with the exception of Augustine's works, far more important Greek Christian literature of the same period, it is difficult to see on what principle the publishers justify their title, which will of course largely sell the book to libraries, and the latter should be warned against misunderstandings. The author himself very properly calls his book *L'Histoire de la Littérature Latine Chrétienne*, and as such the work, as originally intended, should be judged. As for a "History of Christianity", which is not in the author's own title and is no part of the plan, but which is claimed for it by the publishers of this English translation, it may be said very emphatically that they were not well advised to change the title in this way and, as it would appear to us, they do wrong to an excellent scholar. As a history of Christianity the author himself would probably be the first to repudiate the assumption of an attempt which makes the whole book seem at first sight an absurdity. Taken for what Professor de Labriolle himself aims to produce, the work has many points deserving commendation, although it must be said that there are grave limitations to the success and usefulness of the book. The author is a Latin philologist who has ventured to break away from the classical traditions of Latinists and to devote himself to the later Latin literature, not the decadent profane writers who had nothing to say and said it, but the living literature of the Christians who had much to say even though they often said it in less elegant fashion than some who have served as models of Latin style. It is therefore as the work of a classical philologist who

has a broad view of his subject that the work is most valuable. The author has very little interest in theology; he seems to fight shy of it. Inasmuch as the chief interest of the literature he is discussing is theological, the result is, not wholly successful. He is best where the literary interest is predominant, *e.g.*, in the discussion of Christian poetry and the revision of the old Latin Bible by Jerome; for the literary problems of the Vulgate are interesting quite apart from theological subtleties. When the author deals with the great works of epoch-making significance in the thought of Christianity he is unsatisfactory. Thus on page 408 he gives seven lines, without mention of a single work by name, on the writings of St. Augustine against Arianism; when as a fact *De Trinitate* is one of Augustine's greatest works, influenced the thought of the West for all future time, and is by far the most important Latin patristic work on the subject. The discussion of the anti-Pelagian writings fills less than a page, but the small work *De Catechizandis Rudibus* occupies two pages and a half! The author might have utilized the opportunity of showing the connection between Augustine's own life and the thought of the anti-Pelagian treatises, and thus attempted some real interpretation of the works.

The real significance of the book is not so much in what it offers as in what it stands for. It is not a convenient and competent handbook of the "History and Literature of Christianity", but a very praiseworthy, if very uneven, study by a Latin scholar of a period of Latin literature generally rejected with contempt by his pedantic brethren. He has accordingly worked quite too much with the consciousness that he is a pioneer. He regards Bardenhewer's *Patrologie* as "little more than a bibliographical repertory", but although Bardenhewer's book is not very readable, it is a more generally useful and scholarly work. On such an important writer as Augustine, the German's smaller work, so far as the Latin theology is concerned, is more detailed and better proportioned than the French, and it actually devotes more space to Augustine. Occasionally, and especially where his interests lead him from the beaten track, Professor de Labriolle lightens the matter and gives excellent literary criticism.

There are some useful tables in the appendix, one of which gives a general view of Latin Christian literature with contemporaneous Greek literature and profane, *i.e.*, non-Christian, Latin and Greek writers. More valuable is a table giving the Latin Christian literature, author by author and work by work in chronological order, with reference to the best available editions of the texts and to French translations. Inasmuch as the translation of a book means making it available to those who do not read the language in which it was written, it would have been wise to have subjected the book throughout to editorial revision and to have constant reference made to the available English translations. Cardinal Gasquet in his "Foreword" calls attention to such in general, but these should have appeared alongside of, or in place of, the French translations.

The author apparently is not very conversant with English scholarship, or for that matter with German. His reliance upon French works, however, though it may be a certain limitation, may be regarded as a point in his favor, since many of his references will open, at least for the American reader who is accustomed to rely too exclusively upon German scholarship, much excellent French work too little known in this country.

The translation is generally smooth and readable. Without a copy of the original for comparison it is impossible to test its accuracy in critical passages. There are slips from time to time, as when "malice" is used in English in its customary French sense, or when "risky" stands for "risqué". "Massa Perditionis" in Augustine's anti-Pelagian treatises does not mean "mass of lost ones". "Hexaplos" is not the English name for Origen's great biblical work, nor is Abdias the name by which in English the prophet Obadiah is commonly known, though it is his name in Latin. It would have been well had the translation been read by one familiar with English theological terms, that it might have been revised at minor points. It would have been easy to remove various blemishes, not to mention an occasional phrase like "those kind of things" (p. 399). We would recommend the publishers, if they put out other works of a similar character, to see to these minor details. There is an accepted form in the rendering of terms in English theology which deserves to be followed, and it disconcerts the English reader to find gross solecisms in the text, which is in general well rendered.

JOS. CULLEN AYER.

#### BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

*Histoire de la Première Croisade jusqu'à l'Élection de Godefroi de Bouillon.* Par FERDINAND CHALANDON. (Paris: Auguste Piccard. 1925. Pp. 380.)

THE manuscript of this volume was found among the papers left by the late M. Chalandon. Urged by her friends his widow decided to publish it. It is always a question whether a critical work which has not had a final revision by the author should be given to the public. The answer must depend upon two considerations: does it contain new material or new results? will it do credit to the author?

In this case the answers should have been in the negative. This volume contains no new material and merely re-emphasizes the conclusions which M. Chalandon reached in his *Essai sur le Règne d'Alexis Comnène*. In that work he defended the emperor against the accusation of treachery made in the Western sources which have too much influenced modern historians of the First Crusade. His careful, although somewhat partizan, work forced a reconsideration of many points and led to a more just estimate of the conduct of Alexis. But as some of his conclusions were not accepted he decided to write a general history of the Crusades in which full justice should be done to the Greek emperors.

It is difficult to believe that this section on the First Crusade was "à peu près complètement rédigée". While some parts are well worked out, in which the sources are carefully used, other parts need revision and there are many errors. His previous works were marked by critical scholarship and a conscientious use of all available sources. Here this is not the case, and consequently this publication does not do credit to his memory. Although the work is written in an interesting manner and is well suited for the general reader who will not notice the mistakes, it will not add to his prestige among scholars.

He still prefers Anna Comnena's accounts where they conflict with the Western sources. He writes, "Anne Comnène était témoin des événements qu'elle a racontés, et témoin parfaitement renseigné" (p. 124). At that time Anna was a girl of thirteen and she did not begin to write her history until at least forty years later. At times, however, he has to abandon her. He says, "Le combat naval entre la flotte grecque et la flotte normande, raconté par Anne Comnène, ne doit avoir existé que dans l'imagination de celle-ci" (p. 134). Anna has undoubtedly been treated too cavalierly by many scholars, but the really great value of her work will not be realized unless it is used critically.

In addition to the account of the First Crusade this volume contains a sketch of the organization of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. His widow says, "travail qu'il comptait sans doute amplifier". "Ce sujet n'offre rien d'inédit et a déjà été brillamment traité par plusieurs auteurs; mais, dans sa forme actuelle, très claire quoique un peu brève, il m'a paru intéressant, et capable de donner une idée générale de l'ensemble des institutions créées par les Latins dans les territoires conquis." Her estimate of this portion is very just.

It seems hardly worth while to attempt an enumeration of the mistakes, and a correction of even the more glaring would take more space than is allotted for this review. Very many are due simply to carelessness: probably some are the result of difficulty in reading the handwriting of the author. They include a statement (p. 282) that the Arabs who conquered Palestine in the seventh century came from Egypt; misspelling of proper names; errors in summarizing passages from sources; and mistakes in defining technical terms, such as *hommes-liges* and *turcopliers*.

D. C. MUNRO.

*The Geographical Lore of the Time of the Crusades: a Study in the History of Medieval Science and Tradition in Western Europe.* By JOHN KIRTLAND WRIGHT, Ph.D., Librarian of the American Geographical Society. [American Geographical Society, Research Series, no. 15.] (New York: the Society. 1925. Pp. xxi, 563. \$5.00.)

THIS is a valuable and interesting study. The scope of the work is broader than the title indicates, for the author includes under "geographi-

cal lore" something of geology and theology, because "in the Middle Ages geology, geography, and theology were inextricably interwoven".

The first three chapters treat of "the contribution of classical, patristic, and Oriental geography to the West", before the period of the Crusades. Without such a background it would be impossible to understand the ideas subsequently held. Next follows a chapter on the sources examined for the century and a half which the author includes in his study. He has drawn from a very wide variety in order to illustrate the different points of view: "the writings of theologians, philosophers, historians, chroniclers, and topographers"; "pilgrim narratives, letters"; "maps, poetry, romances, and even works of art".

The main subjects discussed are the knowledge and beliefs held concerning cosmogony, cosmology, and cosmography; the atmosphere; the waters; the lands; and regional geography. The last subject naturally is treated at greatest length. There is a short, but good, chapter on cartography, explaining the peculiarities of medieval maps. The value of the work is enhanced by the character and fullness of the notes, over 1600 of them, a bibliography covering fifty pages, and a satisfactory index.

Readers who are not especially interested in geography will find this work valuable for the light it sheds upon the intellectual life of the age. Much of the "geographical lore" was merely the result of naïve belief in anything handed down from antiquity, but some of it was the product of reason, of observation, and even of crude experimentation. One writer proved by experiment that Mount *Amor reorum* ("possibly Mount Moriah") was the centre of the earth. "To clinch the veracity of his observation, he added that he had not been drinking wine and that his eyes were not satiated with sleep." Keen thinkers, like the scholars at Chartres, used their reason freely, even in dealing with statements from the Bible, and refused to be bound by the "halter of authority". Often the same individual at times accepted statements handed down by authority and at other times used his critical ability in rejecting similar statements. Otto of Freising is an illustration of this tendency, and the author, although he used Otto, missed one statement which would have saved him from a mistake, *viz.*, "The medieval Christians made the fundamental error of supposing that Islam is an idolatrous cult, and that Mohammed was worshipped as a god". While this belief was frequently held, it was by no means universal. Otto says it is difficult to believe the legend of the martyrdom of Thimo, because the Mohammedans do not worship idols.

The author has given a very fair presentation, neither overestimating the critical spirit of the age nor yielding to the temptation to recount ludicrous beliefs. Occasionally he seems too laudatory; he says that Conrad of Querfurt was well read in the classical mythology of the places he visited, but does not mention that Conrad saw Mount Parnassus, Mount Olympus, and the Spring of the Muses in Italy.

The method of presentation causes much repetition; on the other hand, the material on a given subject is widely scattered. The passages about Prester John illustrate both of these points, especially the repetitions, including a difference in translating the same passage. In other respects there is little to criticize unfavorably. The few errors which I have noted do not affect the value of the work.

D. C. MUNRO.

*Die Entstehung von Burg und Landgemeinde in Italien: Studien zur Historischen Geographic, Verfassungs- und Sozialgeschichte.* Von Dr. FEDOR SCHNEIDER, Ord. Professor der Geschichte an der Universität Frankfurt am Main. [Abhandlungen zur Mittleren und Neueren Geschichte, herausgegeben von Georg von Below, Heinrich Finke, und Friedrich Meinecke, Heft 68.] (Berlin-Grünewald: Dr. Walther Rothschild. 1924. Pp. xviii, 326. 14 M.)

THE aim of this book is to explain the origins of the jurisdictions of the *castella* and the rural communes of Tuscany and upper Italy by studying in close conjunction the two superficially different forms, and so to show that the rise of free rural communes occurred under the Lombards mainly on a military basis of a purely public character, whatever may have been the modifying influence of the later feudalism. The writer's method is admirable: to revert to the late Roman and Byzantine régimes, in order to disclose what has previously been only hinted at, that the rural communes are older in origin than the city communes, and also that the jurisdictions of the *castella* and rural communes take shape in the Lombard period on legal bases, seldom if ever by fractional division of the power and rights of the later counts and margraves. This is accomplished by a most exhaustive assembly of the sources in the fullest detail, which are then allowed so far as may be to speak for themselves. The writer's hope, apparently justified by the results of his labors, is that thus a new point of view may be gained for the study of the administrative problems of the Hohenstaufen period.

There are four chapters. In the first the author covers the origins of the older *castella* and their districts, their relation to the *civitas*, proceeding with great detail topographically from Tuscany to the Alps. In the second chapter he treats in similar fashion but in even greater detail the military settlements of the Lombards, later called *arimannia*, after first clearing the ground by a preliminary section on the Roman land system in order to show that the *arimannia* were adaptations by the Lombards to their own military needs of the Byzantine *limes*. In the third chapter the first section is devoted to the appearance of the rural communes as developments of the *arimannia* almost exclusively so far as the earlier period is concerned, here described by the study of more than a score of individual cases taken up chronologically; the second and third sections are de-

voted to the rise of the rural communes of imperial origin, treated regionally—Lombardy-Venetia, Piedmont, Emilia, Tuscany, etc. The fourth and last chapter deals with the later *castella* built by the counts, margraves, and bishops from the tenth century on, many of which were privileged from their creation while others gradually assumed communal aspects.

The book is very suggestive. In fleeting sentences and notes there is to be found a broad and very critical survey of the literature on the subject from Muratori to date. The documentation is as complete as one could wish, but not as clear, owing to the too elaborate system of abbreviation of titles. Every chapter has at least one *Beilage*. The arrangement of the book is such as to lessen the value for anyone but the specialist, and for him no index is provided. A single concluding chapter would have been welcome despite the author's claim, surely not entirely sincere, to present no hypotheses, no theories, no generalizations.

EUGENE H. BYRNE.

*The English Conquest of Normandy, 1416-1424: a Study in Fifteenth-Century Warfare.* By RICHARD AGER NEWHALL, Assistant Professor of History in Yale University. [Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany, vol. XIII.] (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1924. Pp. xvii, 367. \$4.00.)

AGINCOURT was a picturesque and a brilliant battle. Joan of Arc is one of the shining lights of history. Looking backward at these beacons, it is difficult to see the fourteen years between the battle and the appearance of Joan as anything more than an inconspicuous shadowed space, whose detail is obscure.

Other writers have pointed out, as Dr. Newhall does, that this period possesses a distinct interest of its own. As distinguished from the preceding period of desultory raiding and fighting, we find in it a definite basis of national policy, worked out on lines like those of Clausewitz, by diplomatic and military methods combined. In the military operations there is a clear-cut strategic idea, consistently followed. But generally the writers give us little of the mechanism of all this.

Dr. Newhall is already favorably known to readers of the late lamented *Military Historian and Economist*, for his article on the discipline of the English army, mentioned in the preface of the present work. Most of his material he had already in hand before the war with Germany. His experience as an officer of the First Division during that war doubtless gave him a more distinctly military point of view; and his long period of convalescence from the wounds received at Cantigny gave him time for contemplation. At any rate, true military insight is shown in this book. That is to say, he gives only incidental attention to the externals of military operations; he goes beneath the surface, and studies the strategic reasons for them and their financial and administrative basis.



Having chosen a period marked by few important field operations, he gives little attention to tactics or tactical organization. The most important battle, that of Verneuil in 1424, being a definite test of English ability to maintain the conquest, is studied in some detail; it is found to present no essential change from the organization and tactics of Agincourt. English tactics were still defensive, even in a strategic offensive. Sieges, of course, were frequent, but they show nothing novel either in attack or defense; he therefore disregards their mechanism.

He is thus free to devote himself to questions generally neglected; and he has found ample material, much of it not previously used. He gives us a remarkably clear and lively picture of the raising and maintenance of the English army, of its discipline and supply, and of its points of superiority, as a permanent force, over the temporary levies opposed to or allied with it. He shows the transition from a feudal army to one raised by contract with the captains—a type of army which soon became universal in Europe, reached its highest development under Wallenstein, and passed over to America, where it was seen in full vigor in the revolutionary “legions”. One may doubt if it has even yet entirely disappeared, for it will be remembered that one of our own citizens proposed to raise whole divisions on his own responsibility for the war with Germany.

We are shown the sources of the funds, from the pawning of the crown jewels to the debasing of the coinage; we see who received them, who disbursed them, and how. As for munitions of war, we can trace the arrow from the tax of “six wing feathers” on every goose in England to the delivery of the finished product in hundred-thousand lots. The writer analyzes the strategic idea of the use of the army, traces for us the lines of the successive frontiers which it guarded, and shows us how it was distributed for offense and defense.

In all this he has rendered a distinct service, particularly in that he thus assists in establishing military history in its proper place as a specialty susceptible of scientific treatment precisely like other historical specialties and possessing a value comparable to that of any other.

OLIVER L. SPAULDING, JR.

*Tudor Studies.* Presented by the Board of Studies in History in the University of London to ALBERT FREDERICK POLLARD, being the Work of Twelve of his Colleagues and Pupils. Edited by R. W. SETON-WATSON. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1924. Pp. x, 319. 15 s.)

THE custom of publishing on some memorial occasion in a scholar's life a collection of studies in his honor prepared by his former students is more usual on the Continent of Europe than in England or in the United States. There is reason both for deprecating and for commending the practice. The scholar so honored must feel a deep sense of gratification at such an acknowledgment of academic debt and personal at-

tachment, and no man increasing in years can fail to draw comfort and happiness from such testimony to the continuance of his influence. There are few finer and warmer human relationships than those between mutually appreciative teacher and student.

The contributors to such a volume obtain also an opportunity for the publication of studies for which in the paucity of vehicles of scholarly communication means do not always otherwise offer themselves. There is not room at present in our historical journals for as many good articles as are or could readily be produced.

From the point of view of general scholarship, however, material published in this form falls singularly readily into oblivion. The detachment of the articles from one another in author and subject, the isolation of such volumes, the unusualness of their appearance and form of publication, all combine to bury excellent results of investigation and thought where future scholars will hardly find them. Of course careful bibliographical records would prevent this, but there are no good historical bibliographies beyond the Middle Ages, and it may readily occur that after a few years even careful students may miss such studies altogether. Of course the same fate often befalls good doctors' theses, but it is generally true that they are less mature in character and they have at least the clue of being published in connection with some well-known educational institution.

These observations, somewhat chill at best, are perhaps unnecessarily foreboding for this particular group of studies. It is a collection of twelve essays of practically uniform excellence and of rather close similarity of subject. They all concern either administrative history or political thought; there is no divagation into economic history and there is little that has to do with ecclesiastical affairs, except in as far as all aspects of history overlap. They fall in the main within the early Tudor period; there are relatively few dates after 1558. Many of them are in definite continuance or further analysis of the respective fields of special study already entered upon by their authors, such as Mr. Neale's essay on the Commons' Privilege of Free Speech in Parliament, another of the group of illuminating essays in which he is gradually clearing up for us the history and procedure of the Elizabethan Parliament, Miss Reid's further contribution to our knowledge of the northern shires in that period, and Miss Davis's anticipation of her fuller work on London during the Reformation period, which is still to come. Professor Pollard may well feel proud of a volume which adds so much detailed knowledge of so significant a period and which declares itself to be so deeply influenced by his inspiration of his students and colleagues.

Testimony must be given to the sound scholarship and excellent writing of these essays. If Mr. Neale's theory of parliamentary freedom of speech is not in all points convincing, or if Miss Reid's explanation of political changes by a somewhat kaleidoscopic arrangement and rearrangement of personalities seems sometimes slightly fanciful, to draw examples from two of the essays already mentioned; or, in others, if

Professor Newton in his interesting and suggestive description of reforms in the royal household makes no account of the progressive fall in the value of money during his period, or if Miss Skeel's *Wales* exercises its influence somewhat negatively, these are all either minor matters, or scholars' differences of opinion, or the results of insufficient contemporary testimony. Certainly there has been no neglect of the contemporary sources. Our complaint—an unusual one—is rather that these writers go to an extreme in their avoidance of the use of and reference to other secondary writings in the same field.

It would be a pity if this vigorous and rising school of historians should continue in an intensified form what has always been a besetting sin of English historical scholarship, its insular unfamiliarity with the methods and results of historical writing in other countries. An American reviewer deeply appreciative of the abilities, services, and opportunities of his masters across the sea, may perhaps be pardoned for mentioning that, quite apart from Continental and other English work, an even half-dozen substantial pieces of American writing have come to his mind as he has read this work, each of which might have been laid under tribute or have suggested discussion or at least been given the courtesy of mention as co-ordinate work. It is true that all history must be drawn from contemporary sources; but it is also true that ultimately the writing of history must be a joint enterprise, and so far as American scholars are concerned they would like to be included in what the editor of this volume describes as "the all-important sphere of British-American co-operation in research".

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY.

*Storhetstidens Litterära Krigsbyten: en Kulturhistorisk-Bibliografisk Studie.* Akademisk Afhandling af O. WALDE. In two volumes. (Upsala: Almqvist and Wiksell. 1916; 1920. Pp. 351; 510. 25 kronor each.)

IN these two volumes Dr. Walde traces with meticulous care the history of the collections of books and manuscripts that found their way to Sweden as spoils of war during the period of the greatness and decline of the Swedish Baltic empire, particularly from Gustavus Adolphus's intervention in the Thirty Years' War to the death of Charles XII. It was an arduous and exacting task that the author set himself to perform, for it involved the examination of thousands of old books scattered over the libraries of Sweden and Finland, with respect to bindings, library marks, *ex libris*, water-marks, evidences of previous ownership, and so forth. These seizures were not made without discussion and a measure of high legal sanction, no less an authority than Hugo Grotius taking two chapters of his *De Jure Belli ac Pacis* to discuss and define in how far one belligerent was justified in seizing books, archives, and various forms of public and private property from another.

The list of places of origin is eloquent of the extent of Swedish intervention during this so-called "period of greatness", *storhetstiden*. Mitau and Riga, Braunsberg and Posen, Olmütz and Nikolsburg (Moravia), Erfurt and Heiligenstadt, Würzburg and Mainz, were obliged to pay this capital levy upon their culture, as was Denmark in 1643-1645 and 1658-1660, and Poland in 1655-1660 and (with Russia) in 1700-1706. Swedish bishops, solicitous of their cathedral schools, rectors of universities and higher schools, reminded their royal masters of their duty to the cause of learning in the fatherland and directed their attention to the bibliographic treasures in the possession of the Jesuit colleges and monasteries within the battle area. In 1658, when Charles X. was on the island of Zealand (Sjælland) engaged in laying siege to Copenhagen, the Bishop of Åbo, in Finland, came to Charles's camp to suggest to the king that, "should the Most High further bless his Majesty's arms and deliver Copenhagen into his hands, his Majesty should bear the academy at Åbo in mind" with respect to its library needs. The obliging and hopeful monarch asked the bishop to remain in the vicinity a few weeks, when, if God granted him victory, the bishop's request should be generously fulfilled.<sup>1</sup> Archives were sought as well as libraries, for they might reveal the designs of the enemy. The most ardent royal "collectors" were Gustavus II. Adolphus, his versatile daughter Christina, and Charles X. of the Palatinate line. Charles XII's efforts were largely confined to Poland, where he sojourned extensively with his troops. The strenuousness that marked his many active campaigns militated against the accumulation of much literary booty.

The fact that Sweden has not been subjected to devastating invasions, as have the states of central Europe, has permitted the preservation of an appreciable portion of the seizures made, at the libraries of Uppsala, Lund, Strängnäs, Västerås, and Linköping, to say nothing of Helsingfors in present-day Finland. It is this circumstance that has made Dr. Walde's enterprise possible. Happily his study is far more than an episode in the wanderings of books; it is, as the subtitle properly suggests, a contribution to the history of the diffusion of European culture. It is only just to add that Sweden did not behave differently in this matter from other nations, though its efforts may have been crowned with greater success.

W. W.

*Industrial Society in England towards the End of the Eighteenth Century.* By WITT BOWDEN. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1925. Pp. xii, 343. \$3.50.)

THIS is an important book for students of British history in the past several centuries. In four chapters, entitled respectively, the Age of Invention, the Triumph of the Machine, the Great Industrialists, and the Industrial Workers, the author undertakes to describe the conditions that led to the extraordinary activity in England in the eighteenth century in

<sup>1</sup> Both king and bishop were disappointed in that particular enterprise.

contriving mechanical devices, to the introduction of these devices as normal appliances in industry, to the rise and organization of the capitalist manufacturers that followed, and to the conditions of life thereby entailed on laborers. Dr. Bowden approaches these subjects with a directness and brings to their discussion a wealth of facts unsurpassed by any previous writer on these topics. Future students of the questions he treats will be indebted to him for stimulating suggestions and for a solid bibliography, with the items of which his ample foot-notes show that he is familiar. The best chapters in the book are the first and second, which contain accounts of the methods in vogue in the British Patent Office in the eighteenth century, of the propaganda for stimulating invention, and of the actual introduction of machines as useful appliances, and the third, in which the author has incorporated much of the material contained in his *Rise of the Great Manufacturers in England* and in his recent articles in this *Review*, which a too scrupulous modesty prevented him from citing either in his bibliography or his foot-notes. The least suggestive chapter is the fourth, in which the author, though offering fruits of his own investigations, is nevertheless traversing ground made familiar by earlier writers, the Webbs and Hammonds, for example.

The most serious weakness in Dr. Bowden's work results from insufficient familiarity with the political organization of English society in the eighteenth century, which obscures for him in some cases the difficulties and methods of the large industrialists in asserting their strength to the extent that their importance deserved. Dr. Bowden raises many interesting questions, but the answers he suggests are not always as specific as the facts he adduces would seem to warrant. For example, he recognizes the pressure of an expanding trade in creating a demand for a greater volume of production and so in promoting a "revolution in technique" (ch. I.), but in his effort to introduce less tangible forces to explain what he calls the "spirit of invention" (p. 51) he seems to hesitate to attribute due weight to these current economic conditions. This same apparent reluctance to state a concrete conclusion causes the author to be less definite in his third chapter than his facts seem to justify. He has brought out facts in this book and other places to show clearly the part played by the organized participation of the British industrialists in the change from a policy of mercantilism to freer trade, but he weakens the statement of his conclusion by indefinite references to what he calls "tendencies toward a general policy of *laissez-faire* and economic liberalism" (p. 210). Finally, it is unfortunate that the author, who has done more than any other to make known the rise and organization of the great manufacturers, should not have discovered *The Merchants and Manufacturers Magazine of Trade and Commerce*, published 1785-1786. The material in this periodical would probably not have changed any of Dr. Bowden's important conclusions, but it would have smoothed the way for the interpretation of facts he has gathered from other sources.

WILLIAM THOMAS LAPRADE.

*L'Esprit Révolutionnaire en France et aux États-Unis à la Fin du XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle.* Par BERNARD FAÿ. [Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée, tome VII.] (Paris: Édouard Champion, 1925. Pp. 378. 40 fr. for this and bibliographical supplement.)

*Bibliographie Critique des Ouvrages Français relatifs aux États-Unis (1770-1800).* By BERNARD FAÿ. (Paris: Édouard Champion, 1925. Pp. 111.)

ASSUMING that history has to do with the activities of man in the past, Professor Robinson once said (Oh, more than once no doubt!) that historians know much about the past but very little about man. The reproach is perhaps not altogether undeserved. Sixty or seventy years ago, when "science" was becoming the fashion, historians found themselves between the devil and the deep sea. Confronted with the dilemma of becoming "scientific" or of being dubbed "mere literary fellows", they chose at all hazards to be scientific. Their method of achieving this was to confine themselves to the bare relation of such "facts" as could not be disputed; so that, if you still questioned their scientific standing, you were invited to verify their serried ranks of references and find a mistake if you could and, if you were still under the illusion that they were literary fellows, you had only to read their books.

Now the "facts" that can be incontrovertibly proved by a verification of foot-notes (so incontrovertibly proved that when a paper is read at the meetings of the Association there is less than nothing left to "discuss") are chiefly those that relate to what man has done, as, for example, the fact that Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence. With such facts historians will always be concerned as a matter of course. But for the future, at least if they wish to contribute more than they have done to an understanding of the creature called man, historians must concern themselves with what men have thought about what they did, with those most important of revolutions—the revolutions that occur in people's heads. These are "facts" too, although they can not always be proved past discussion by foot-notes. It would be difficult perhaps to refer to "the testimony of two independent witnesses, not self-deceived", to prove, for example, that the state of mind of Thomas Jefferson, on July 4, 1776, was thus and so. Yet surely the state of mind which conditioned the writing and the approval of such a notable document as the Declaration of Independence is of first-rate importance. A difficult and treacherous field of inquiry to enter, no doubt, not inviting to the graduate students whom we recommend as "faithful and industrious" chaps, but still necessary to be entered by historians, even at the risk of being set down as neither scientific nor historians.

M. Faÿ's book is the more welcome because it is an attempt to explore this virgin field. He has examined the revolutionary state of mind which produced a bond of sympathy, a *rapprochement*, between France

and the United States, roughly speaking between 1774 and 1799. His book is not an account of the "alliance" as a diplomatic or an economic phenomenon. The alliance he has to do with is an affair of *l'esprit*. He is concerned to show how the state of mind in each country was "influenced" by what was happening in the other, or rather by some idealized conception of what was happening in the other, some mystical image or fiction, some *als ob*, of what the other was. As a matter of course the work has therefore to do with ideas, opinions, and beliefs, as these were expressed in books and other literary remains; not indeed with the abstract validity or logical relation of "ideas", but with their "pénétration et leurs transformations dans l'esprit des individus et des masses"—that is to say, scarcely with ideas as such at all, but rather with the emotional preconceptions and vague aspirations that determine great historical events. The work is in fact a study in eighteenth-century revolutionary psychology.

And, psychology or whatever you wish to call it, an admirable work it is, learned, penetrating, well written—it may be a trifle too long! The author has perhaps done his best work in showing how the French constructed for themselves a mystical idea of "America", and how this ideal construction played its part in the drama of the Revolution. The *philosophes* had already constructed a haven of refuge for the disaffected—a kind of utopia of the spirit, a harmonious "state of nature" which the good God had intended man to discover and enter into. And what could be a better proof of it than the actual existence, across the sea, of this happy virgin society which had just thrown off the yoke? Writers like Raynal, who knew nothing of America, travellers like Brissot, who saw only what they came to see, soldiers like Lafayette, who returned looking for new ventures—all these helped Frenchmen to rediscover America. "This virgin land where everything was still to do . . . was for these legislators as beautiful as a block of marble is to a sculptor who sees in it his ideal realized. . . . It was an unlimited possibility, a realm of experience for Europe, wherein philosophy might realize all its dreams, and create its Eden." There were books that told a different story; and real American land-agents were often enough found to be sophisticated liars. But no matter. The devotees of America were not interested in America for itself, but for themselves and for France. They needed to "use the United States"; and they could use it only by idealizing it, by giving it a configuration, a *Gestalt*, in harmony with that ideal society which they hoped to create.

M. Fay has done a real service in recreating for us this ideal America, and in showing how great a part it played in the *esprit révolutionnaire*. Will not someone write a book showing how the revolutionary state of mind of the eighteenth century was also nourished on an ideal conception of classical republicanism and Roman virtue? Just why did Madame Roland often weep to think that she was not born a Spartan? Just why did John Adams ask himself if Demosthenes, had he been a deputy to the first



Continental Congress, would have been satisfied with non-importation and non-exportation agreements? To know the answers to these questions would help much to understand both the French and the American revolutions.

Not content with a "list of works cited" which runs to eighteen pages, M. Faÿ has prepared a separate bibliography of French works published between 1770 and 1800. These are listed by years and under three heads: (1) geography, travel, description; (2) history, politics, documents, etc.; (3) literature, philosophy, religion, etc. Altogether about 225 works are listed. The list is followed by a "critical study" of about sixty pages. The thirty years from 1770 to 1800 are divided into five periods. Each period is the subject of a chapter in which M. Faÿ characterizes the period and then notes some of the more important works appearing in that period. The work is an extremely valuable supplement to the main study.

CARL BECKER.

*The Foreign Policy of Castlereagh, 1815-1822: Britain and the European Alliance.* By C. K. WEBSTER, M.A., Professor of International Politics in the University of Wales. (London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd. 1925. Pp. xiv, 598. 25 s.)

PROFESSOR WEBSTER's book is a contribution of the first order in the field of diplomatic history. Too many works which deal with foreign policy draw their materials from the archives of a single power, and therefore give an incomplete and necessarily prejudiced account of the events with which they deal. Not so with Mr. Webster's volume. It is based upon exhaustive research in the archives of London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna, and Petersburg and represents a synthesis not of some but of virtually all the most important first-hand materials. The diplomatic correspondence in the Ministerio del Estado at Madrid and in the Archivo General at Seville has not been utilized, but even for the Spanish revolution of 1820 or the question of the Spanish colonies it seems, from the reviewer's knowledge, hardly likely that this correspondence would modify in any essential respect Mr. Webster's narrative.

Next to the painstaking and thorough treatment of the sources, the most striking thing about the book is its judicious analysis of persons and policies. The opening chapter, dealing with the central personalities of the period, with the Prince Regent, the ministry, the principal diplomatic agents of Great Britain, and the representatives of the most important of the foreign powers at London, contains a series of admirable pen-pictures that have the clear-cut character of etchings. While the estimate of Castlereagh himself is impregnated with a quiet admiration and may seem, in some respects, too favorable, it is impossible not to admire the detachment and balance which pervade the analysis as a whole.

Professor Webster's central thesis is that Castlereagh was the founder of the idea of diplomacy by conference. It was he, and not the Tsar,

who, by article VI. of the Treaty of Paris of November 20, 1815, wrote into that instrument provision for periodic meetings of the sovereigns or their ministers. The system thus established he sought to carry on. Though he failed, out of his labors, at a later epoch, was to grow the concert of Europe. Mr. Webster freely admits the limitations of the British Foreign Secretary, his failure to identify himself with the great positive forces of the time, his inability to interpret public opinion, his failure to solve the question of the relation of the small powers to the great ones. But he holds, none the less, that Castlereagh made a great positive contribution to the practice of diplomacy.

Inevitably linked with the notion of diplomacy by conference, in the period treated, is the question of intervention in the domestic concerns of the smaller European states. Mr. Webster emphasizes, and explains with great skill, the evolution of Castlereagh's thought on this matter and relates it to the later diplomacy of Canning.

But with regard to both these fundamental lines of thought, the book seems unduly favorable to its central figure. Diplomacy by conference Castlereagh may have originated, but was he after all any more ready to confer than Metternich or Alexander? Was he any more devoted to European accord and European peace than the Tsar? And, on the question of intervention, was he so far removed from his contemporaries? It is to be remembered that he connived at the "modification" of the Sicilian constitution, approved the Carlsbad decrees, and was not averse in principle to Austrian intervention in Naples. His statement to Neumann that the British government was "pleased to see evil germs destroyed without the power to give our approbation openly" is a most revealing one. In essence, was not the British minister's later opposition to intervention based, not so much on principle, as on the fact that such action, *taken in the name of the Alliance*, threatened the destruction of the whole idea of diplomacy by conference? The *form* of intervention espoused by Metternich and the Tsar Castlereagh could not approve, but was he so far removed from them in spirit?

To analyze Mr. Webster's work more particularly, there are many phases of it which deserve special attention. Only a few can be noted. The years 1816 and 1817, especially 1816, have received very little attention from the historians of foreign policy. Mr. Webster sheds much light on the questions with which they deal. His treatment of the reparations question and of the Tsar's proposals of disarmament, though a little scant, is of much value. The discussion of the efforts of Alexander and of the Prussians to build up a system of territorial and political guaranties draws attention to a fascinating problem which might have been more fully developed. The analysis of Castlereagh's policy in the Eastern crisis is particularly enlightening.

The chapter on Britain and the New World lies a little apart from the main theme of the volume. This accounts for its brevity, though one can not help wishing something more. Even so, there are interesting con-

tributions to be noted, in particular the emphasis on Castlereagh's very positive interest in and sympathy with monarchical government in South America. Great and due credit is given the British minister for the Great Lakes agreement of 1817. On one point, however, Mr. Webster seems to overvalue very decidedly Castlereagh's influence, that is, in relation to American recognition of the Spanish colonies. John Quincy Adams was at no time during the discussions of 1817-1818 in favor of recognition. He used the Foreign Secretary's disclosures to sustain a view already held rather than to postpone action otherwise to be taken. The Florida treaty was always the essence of the business.

Mr. Webster's work is so accurate in detail and so careful in statement as to make minute critical analysis almost superfluous. One might question his description of the sale of the ships to Spain by Russia in 1817 as an attempt to "challenge British sea-power", or of Monroe's message of 1821 as foreshadowing the recognition of the Spanish-American states, or of John Quincy Adams as "almost against his will an instrument in the creation of better relations with Britain". But these are, of course, matters of detail.

The book contains very valuable appendixes, throwing much light in particular on Anglo-Austrian relations for the years 1819-1822. Selected portions of Lieven's despatches to Nesselrode for the years 1818-1822 are of special value in view of the present difficulties in the way of research in the Russian archives. It is, on the other hand, to be regretted that the book is not provided with a more adequate index.

All in all, the book sets a standard which one would be glad to see more often attained in the writing of diplomatic history.

DEXTER PERKINS.

*Die Deutsche Geschichtschreibung von den Befreiungskriegen bis zu unsern Tagen: Geschichtschreibung und Geschichtsauffassung.*  
VON GEORG VON BELOW. Zweite, wesentlich erweiterte Auflage.  
[Handbuch der Mittelalterlichen und Neueren Geschichte.]  
(Munich and Berlin: R. Oldenbourg. 1924. Pp. xvi, 207.  
5.50 M.)

ONE of the main currents of thought to-day is an intense interest in historiography. A wealth of new material is being poured out, most of which, it would seem, deals with the history of historical writing in the nineteenth century. In this evaluation the work of Professor von Below, which appeared in 1917, was of notable importance, and it is a good augury that a new, revised and enlarged, edition has so soon been called for. These qualifying adjectives are employed advisedly; for the present book is half again as large as the former. The accretion has not been effected wholly by the addition of a special chapter upon "Die Deutsche Wirtschaftsgeschichtliche Literatur", for a great deal of new matter has been inserted in the earlier chapters. It is interesting to compare the matter

and the method of this work with that of Fueter and Gooch. The two latter have primarily labored to set forth the dominant historical ideas of the writers with whom they deal. Below, on the other hand, is more interested in showing how the great genetic events of nineteenth-century history, the new thinking and new interpretation of that fecund era, influenced the writers of history in Germany. There is no doubt in my mind that the latter is the superior method—the critical and philosophic method—if one is to get to the bed-rock of ideas. *Zeitgeist* and *Geistiges Leben* contribute more to the birth of ideas than individual men, unless they be geniuses. Most historians, like most other writers, are instruments of refraction. They do not generate the light, they merely disseminate it from new angles. The critical method of an able historian, his analysis and synthesis, is usually of more interest and more value than his interpretation, for it is more his own, it is more individualistic. Below finds the twin sources of nineteenth-century historiography in the romantic movement and Ranke's source-method (*Quellenmethode*). Ranke's influence runs like a red thread through the book and Sybel and Meinecke are his greatest successors. (The index under these names is significant.) Next come Tröltzsch, Treitschke, Hegel, and Droysen. There is room for protest in this treatment, both as to quantitative and qualitative valuation. It is a canon of German historical scholarship that Ranke is infallible, the perfect scholar. Veneration of him amounts almost to idolatry. Yet neither Ranke's scholarship nor Hegel's philosophy is sufficient for this day and generation. They do not satisfy the modern historical or philosophical interest. There is too much of these two in this book. Modern German historical scholarship is not tied so closely to early nineteenth-century moorings as Below would have us believe, nor is Ranke the voice on Sinai to-day. At least so it may be hoped. One omission in the long list of names considered is curious; it is that of Heeren. Scant justice has yet been done to Heeren, who in spite of his defects merits more recognition than he has received. Two suggestive works on historiography which Below has employed and which have not been noticed, so far as I know, in America, are Bresslau's *Geschichte der Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (Hanover, 1912) and Rothacker's *Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften* (Tübingen, 1920).

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

*The Rise of Louis Napoleon.* By F. A. SIMPSON, Fellow and Lecturer of Trinity College, Cambridge. With unpublished Documents. New edition. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1925. Pp. xxiii, 384. 15 s.)

No more important studies of the second French emperor have been made in many years than the two publications of Mr. Simpson. The first, which is here reviewed, appeared originally in 1909 and is now reissued with a few slight additions, chiefly in bibliography; the second, *Louis*

*Napoleon and the Recovery of France*, carries the tale forward from 1848, where the present volume ends, to 1856.

Napoleon III. has been commonly regarded as one of the most enigmatic characters in recent history. This is partly due to the violent bias of his contemporary biographers, who glorify or caricature him for political reasons. It is probably also the result of his habit of silence; from the Abbé Sieyès to Mr. Coolidge, it has been the fate or the fortune of silent men to receive the most contradictory interpretations. The generally prevalent notion of Napoleon, however, is that of a rather weak but crafty man, half unscrupulous politician, half visionary dreamer, the tinsel glories of his empire a mere cloak for corruption and greed. Mr. Simpson undertakes to replace this unfavorable verdict by a juster, because closer and more discriminating, analysis. In this effort he is eminently successful.

Two distinct impressions remain in the reader's mind as he closes the book. The first is a clear notion of Louis Napoleon, the pretender, as Mr. Simpson makes us see him; a young man without genius, but with dogged courage and determination, the only really alert member of the family then alive, who forces his way up from obscurity by the sheer reiteration of his name coupled with remarkable skill in taking advantage of his opponents' mistakes. It is a triumph of judicious advertising and political intelligence. Yet it can not be called opportunism, because the pretender's creed is unwavering. Withal he preserves a certain dignity in the most undignified situations and an almost quixotic humanitarianism. One can not help a certain sympathy with this young man for all his self-consciousness; one feels that he was more genuine than has been supposed.

The other impression is of Mr. Simpson's remarkable skill, not only in creating a mass-effect, but also in the careful and just appreciation of significant details. The pretender is disclosed as rising, not on stepping-stones of his dead self, but on stepping-stones of his repeated failures, to higher things; like William of Orange and Washington, he thrives on defeat, and the author takes pains to develop the importance of each successive phase in Louis Napoleon's career. The Italian adventure of 1831 was significant, because the death of his brother during this affair made practically certain his eventual succession to the headship of the family and because his romantic interest in Italy was destined to become the pivot of his later foreign policy. (Mr. Simpson's belief may be noted that the princes had probably given "verbal though not written engagements" to the Carbonari.) The Strasbourg failure in 1836 was serious enough to frighten the Orleanist government, which made it at least a satisfactory piece of publicity. At the same time it lost him the hand of the Princess Mathilde, a serious blow, as the author believes, to the success of his subsequent career. In similar fashion, we are shown how the prince turned his trial after the Boulogne fiasco into a forum for advertising his claims and made the prison of Ham a veritable publishing-house of Bonapartist propaganda.

There are, no doubt, opportunities for minor criticisms. Napoleon I.'s projected adoption of Louis Napoleon's elder brother in 1804, described by Madame de Rémusat, is not mentioned. On page 217 "the visitor to Ham is still shown the doorway", though on page 198 we are correctly informed that since the World War there is no doorway left to show. "Although by this means they prolonged their immediate dictatorship in Paris" (p. 275), said of the Socialists in 1848, is inaccurate, because they were never in control from the first. The disingenuous character of the national workshops is not clearly brought out.

However, the general solidity and impartiality of this book are beyond all praise. The style is brilliant, without being fatiguingly so. The critical bibliography is noteworthy.

EUGENE N. CURTIS.

*The Origins of the War of 1870.* New Documents from the German Archives. By ROBERT HOWARD LORD, Professor of History in Harvard University. [Harvard Historical Studies, vol. XXVIII.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1924. Pp. xvi, 305. \$3.50.)

IN this unique source-book drawn from the lately opened archives of the German Foreign Office we have for the first time an invaluable series of some 235 despatches, accurately transcribed, covering the critical days of July 4-15, 1870. In addition there are many pertinent documents from the archives of Vienna and Madrid and two valuable memoranda of King William, first published in 1921. It is fortunate that this rich collection was assembled and interpreted by one who is both skilled editor and competent historian. Indeed, the careful precision with which Professor Lord has edited his documents is fully matched by the clear narrative and masterly analysis of his introductory chapters.

We are told that not all the German official papers are open to investigators, notably those bearing on the early history of the Hohenzollern Candidacy. Yet to be explored, also, are the archives of the French Foreign Office (or the official publication when it reaches the year 1870), as well as the private papers of Napoleon III., King William, the Sigmaringen family, and Bismarck. It is unlikely, however, that future disclosures will seriously disturb the conclusions already reached. At any rate, Professor Lord's clear and convincing appraisal of the evidence is now the best in existence on the period covered. From the standpoint of Prussian policy he corrects and extends the work of such scholars as Delbrück, Hesselbarth, and Fester.

There is little doubt that after 1866 Bismarck considered war with France both desirable and inevitable. Whatever the origin of Leopold's candidacy may have been, it is clear that the North German Chancellor did his utmost to further the project. In the last stages of the crisis of 1870, if not before, he sought to provoke a war which he had good reason

to believe Germany could win. The texts under review are unrolled impressively before us like a scroll on which is written the folly of Napoleon III. and the craftiness of the Prussian minister president. The fateful Ems telegram is now seen in its complete setting. Few competent scholars even in France any longer refer to Bismarck's curt version of the famous despatch as a falsification, but intentionally deceptive it certainly was. Only a spark was needed to touch off the powder mine, and that spark was deliberately struck. The volume before us makes this abundantly plain.

The fresh material presents little that is startling; it tends rather to confirm views now generally accepted. A new letter from Bismarck to Abeken on July 5 is well characterized as "a model of Bismarck's art of *suppressio veri et suggestio falsi*" (p. 36). Among the many texts printed for the first time number 181 is perhaps the most significant. This telegram from minister to king on July 13 fully corroborates the testimony of Lord Augustus Loftus that Bismarck intended to force events if necessary by addressing to France a "summons" (*Aufforderung*). To his unbounded joy the French government spared him that necessity!

With a meticulous care that fairly glorifies the infinitesimal, Dr. Lord has corrected the chronology of decisions and events, especially those of July 13. Incidentally, he demonstrates that the time consumed by the coding, decoding, and transmission of official telegrams has not been properly considered hitherto.

The minor errors noted are so few as to be negligible. It might be suggested, however, that the phrase "hat mich eben rufen lassen" (no. 161, p. 219) is quoted on page 97 in a slightly misleading sense. Presumably Minister von Varnbüler had sent for Count Radolinski, not "called" him.

*The Origins of the War of 1870* may be commended warmly to all students of diplomatic history. Upholding as it does the best traditions of historical scholarship, this study will bear the closest scrutiny. The war guilt was heavy in 1870 on both sides of the Rhine, to be sure, yet it is interesting to find that the new evidence leaves the chief responsibility exactly where we have long thought it belonged—in Prussia.

WILLIAM A. FRAYER.

*King Edward VII.: a Biography.* By Sir SIDNEY LEE. Volume I. *From Birth to Accession: 9th November, 1841, to 22nd January, 1901.* (London: Macmillan and Company; New York: Macmillan Company. 1925. Pp. xii, 830. 31 s. 6 d.)

THOSE who recall the storm of criticism which greeted the biographical sketch of Edward VII. published in a supplementary volume of the *Dictionary of National Biography* have wondered what fortune would follow Sir Sidney Lee in this, his second and far more ambitious attempt



at the life of his late sovereign. Former critics who complained that the subject was not treated with sufficient respect and who objected to the revelations regarding the unhappy boyhood of the former Prince of Wales may now have other grounds for complaint. But in the last dozen years common sense on the part of the royal family, the more democratic tendencies of the period, and an appreciation that the life of the prince and of his contemporaries is no longer a closed and mysterious book to historical students have all combined to give the author access to much unpublished material and permission to make free use of it. The result is a final official biography.

It ranks far above Strachey's *Queen Victoria* in the materials used. On the other hand the ponderous character of the narrative almost deprives the book of those human and humane qualities which we are now accustomed to associate with the late Prince of Wales. On almost every page is the statement of the gracious characteristics which marked his contact with people. At every turn there is a reference to the prince's *joie de vivre*. Yet those very qualities are lacking in the book. It is a valuable but melancholy record, in which the private elements which justly made the prince so popular are submerged in a flood of details as to his travels and public appearances. There is not a *bon mot* or a joke in all its eight hundred pages; yet it is the life of a man who above all things loved a good story and himself told many. Nor does the style relieve the dull monotony of the record. As we recall the many brilliant pages with which in other books Sir Sidney Lee has delighted us, we frankly confess that the puzzle of these many unadorned chapters gives pause.

Perchance the fact that it was at the request of George V. that this biography was undertaken had a subduing effect. The access to the royal archives, to materials from the Foreign Office, to the voluminous personal correspondence of Edward VII., and to an immense mass of other sources may have also had its deadening influence. In passing we note that materials from the archives of the Russian embassy in London were available to the author before the recognition of the Soviet government finally placed those sources in the present official Russian hands. Certainly if similar sources of information are to be used for the second volume, covering the actual reign of Edward VII., the work will be an invaluable record of the first troubled decade of the present century. As it is, there are many instances in the present volume in which fresh light is cast not only on British history but on foreign affairs generally.

The youth of the Prince of Wales reveals the pedantic, meticulous, and mistaken educational programme laid down by the Prince Consort for his eldest son. From the régime which almost deprived the prince of companions of his own generation and which tried to lay on a boy who did not like books an intolerable burden of learning, the death of his father partially relieved the prince. There followed, after 1861, a longer period during which the obstinacy and distrust of Queen Victoria limited his

access to official sources of information and prevented him from taking a natural and normal part in the history of his own time. The prince was always anxious to "be of use". He was forbidden by the queen to take any active part in the constitutional life of the nation. Yet at the same time his abundant energy and vitality, which sought occupation in the social and sporting life of the day, was also a cause of complaint by his mother. It was not until the closing years of her reign that the queen, when the prince was almost fifty years of age, grudgingly agreed that he might see all official papers. Thus in 1892 ended a campaign which had begun thirty years before. The queen always had maintained that the prince talked too much. It is a question whether she was not also influenced by the desire to keep matters in her own hands.

The fact is again exposed that the prince was singularly unable to keep his private judgment on the side of success. In nearly every incident of foreign politics during a period of nearly forty years he was unable to "pick a winner". Whether with regard to matters of diplomacy or in his support of individuals he almost invariably "put his money on the wrong horse". Exception to this record of bad luck is found in the influence which he attempted to exert during the period 1880-1886 on the choice of members of the Cabinets. Then many of his friends were included in lists of appointments and promotions.

In belated fashion, however, his early support of the idea that an Anglo-French entente and an Anglo-Russian agreement might be secured finally won. This was not until after his accession to the throne in 1901, though the prince first favored an entente with France in 1866. The influence of the prince on British affairs was always exaggerated on the Continent. At times the prince was useful to England, chiefly because of his charm of manner and because of his vast fund of information. He was a man who knew everybody and had seen everything, as Disraeli commented, and this constant personal contact with people, together with a remarkable memory, made him an invaluable source.

The closing chapters of this volume are devoted in the main to the quarrels between the prince and the German Kaiser. Indeed these final pages are almost a record of the early years of the reign of William II. Here we find to the full the fixed impression of the author that no good can be said of the late Kaiser. The whole story of Anglo-German relations awaits the second volume.

Ample credit is also given to the interest which the prince showed throughout his life in the social welfare of the people. His activities in their behalf, which did not have a political bias, were numerous. As the arbiter of fashion, as the genial and kindly gentleman, and as the punctilious martinet in respect to all details of ceremonial observance the prince stands out in these pages. Disraeli dubbed him "Prince Hal"; the author applies to him Shakespeare's lines:

Our courteous Anthony,  
Whom ne'er the word of "No" woman heard speak.

A. L. P. DENNIS.

*These Eventful Years: the Twentieth Century in the Making as told by Many of its Makers, being the Dramatic Story of All that has happened throughout the World during the most Momentous Period in All History.* In two volumes. (London and New York: Encyclopaedia Britannica Company. 1924. Pp. xxi, 692; 695. 50 s.)

THERE is little in the *salade macédoine* which the Encyclopaedia Britannica Company has issued under the above title to interest serious historians. And there is perhaps less in these two heavy tomes which approaches in value the great compendium for which the publishers are famous.

In two matters this publication falls below the promise of its preface: "The Editor believes strongly that he serves the cause of truth best when he unites in this book the different viewpoints of men coming from many countries scattered over the continents of the world, each giving his version of events as he has seen them." It is only in one or two instances, such as the description of the battle of Jutland by Admiral Jellicoe and Admiral Scheer, that both sides of any important question are given. The greatest part of the work is intensely Anglo-American.

It is also stated that "each chapter is written for this work, and for this alone, and has not appeared elsewhere". This may be literally true, but very many of the chapters seem to be "re-writes" of articles which have appeared in other publications. Time and again, as one reads through the two volumes, one encounters passages which are distinctly familiar.

The first volume starts off with four chapters in which Mr. J. L. Garvin, the editor of the *Observer* (London), compresses "The History of our own Times"—a feat of condensation which rivals that of Mr. H. G. Wells. Mr. Garvin is one of the outstanding publicists of Great Britain. He is a man of real ability and passionate conviction, in fact, his vogue in the world of journalism has been largely a result of the forthright and *ex cathedra* way in which he expresses his personal opinions. The fifth chapter, on the Causes of the World War, is contributed by Dr. Carlton J. H. Hayes of Columbia, and the sixth chapter, Secret Treaties and Open Covenants, is the work of Dr. Charles Seymour of Yale. Both have written on the same subject elsewhere. There are then two chapters on the history of the war by Major-General Sir Frederick B. Maurice. He also has written frequently and at greater length on the same subject.

And so one could go on through most of the table of contents. Reparations are discussed by John Foster Dulles; Inter-Allied Debts by Bernard M. Baruch; Taxation by E. R. A. Seligman.

From this point on, 500 pages are devoted to various nations. The problems of France are discussed by Albert Thomas; Belgium by Brand Whitlock; Italy by Nitti; Germany by Maximilian Harden; Scandinavia

by Georg Brandes. As these instances show, most of these chapters are presented in a form of thinly veiled propaganda. Chapter XLVI., on the Deliverance and Reunion of Poland, by Dr. Roman Dyboski, is perhaps the worst example of such patriotic, not to say nationalistic, history. On the other hand, the next chapter, by Baron Alexander Meyendorff, on the new Baltic states of Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania is as badly biassed by hostility as some of those which I have mentioned above are by patriotic boosting.

A pleasant exception in this section of the work is formed by the three chapters on the Balkans, contributed by H. Charles Woods, who knows this troublous part of the world intimately through long journalistic experience. "Ireland's Problems", by Sir Horace Plunkett, is also interesting. In these chapters we have a serious attempt at an objective appraisal of an exceedingly complicated situation.

Beginning with chapter LXII. there is a complete change in the type of articles. Politics and history are left behind. This section begins with Twentieth-Century Literature, by Henry Seidel Canby. Mr. John G. Fletcher contributes a chapter on the New Poetry and Mr. Clive Bell one on Aesthetic Truth and Futurist Nonsense. There then follow some interesting chapters on popular science by J. Arthur Thomson, Madame Curie, and others. There are two chapters giving an interesting résumé of archaeological discoveries in the Near East and Central America. To me, the most interesting chapter in this section was the Harvest Time in Medicine and Surgery, by Dr. Ray L. Wilbur.

There is a chapter on Psychoanalysis by Dr. Freud; Sir Oliver Lodge discusses Psychical Research; Charles M. Schwab is the author of Some Reflections on Big Business; Viscountess Rhondda describes the Suffragist Movement; Dr. James Brown Scott contributes a paper on the Break-down of International Law; Dr. Carver of Harvard discusses prohibition; Mr. Lawrence Perry International Sport; and, as a last chapter, Colonel House writes on Anglo-American Relations and the Peace of the World.

It is difficult to estimate the value of a collection of articles of such varying merit. Few people could glance through the table of contents without seeing some chapters that they wanted to read, but even fewer would be interested in reading any large part of the two volumes. *These Eventful Years* has none of the value as a reference-book of the great *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, and few of the chapters can claim to rank in objectivity or authority with the contributions in that valuable work.

ARTHUR BULLARD.

*John Viscount Morley: an Appreciation and some Reminiscences.*

By JOHN H. MORGAN. (London: John Murray; Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1924. Pp. xiii, 215. 10 s. 6 d.)

As is known to all, Lord Morley left distinct instructions that no biography should be written. This wish, General Morgan, one of his intimate friends, could be depended upon to observe in its full strictness.

With Lord Morley's private life [he says] I have not dealt at all. Had I done so I could, as I have said in the pages that follow, have told a tale of singular devotion, a tale of one whose whole life was a noble comment on the text, "Bear ye one another's burdens", and who, living, fulfilled the law of Christ. But this is an appreciation, not a biography. It is, however, an appreciation suffused with personal reminiscences.

This statement indicates clearly and accurately the scope of the present volume. During Morley's lifetime General Morgan contributed to the *Nineteenth Century* and to the *Times Literary Supplement* three articles on his writings and his *Recollections*, which are reprinted here, and he now adds a fresh paper on the lives of Gladstone and Cobden. All these studies abound with thoughtful criticism which deserves serious attention. Therefore, it is not in disparagement that one points to the first three chapters of the book rather than to the last four as constituting the part which will be scanned with most interest by most readers.

The essays on Morley's books might have been written by a stranger, but no one who was not of his inner circle could have written the three chapters entitled the Thinker in Politics, Characteristics, and Causeries. General Morgan pays unstinted homage to Morley's character, styling him "one of the noblest men I have ever known, and the most truthful". "He had an apprehension which pierced like a sword." He was "the most distinguished member" of the British Cabinet at the moment when it declared war in 1914.

Notwithstanding encomium so generous, General Morgan does not decline to comment upon certain points which were accentuated in the press soon after Morley's death by some whose admiration was less than his own. For example:

There is one aspect of his career which requires delicate handling, and which yet cannot be passed over in silence. I refer to his political ambition. The ascent to high place is, as Bacon has reminded us, often "by a winding stair". Did Lord Morley himself never choose that tortuous mode of ascent? Was he as indifferent as he seemed to the arts by which men rise?

In discussing this matter (which embraces Morley's action in siding with Rosebery against Harcourt) General Morgan finds nothing which can not be covered by "the fundamental contradiction of two vocations". Morley was primarily a moralist, but by becoming a politician he had to deal with the phenomena of self-seeking and jealousy as he found them. He was ambitious. He said himself that he did not like "playing second fiddle".

There were [says General Morgan] few high offices of State to which he did not at one time or another aspire. Indeed, why not? He had great abilities, and like most men, was conscious of them without being conscious of his limitations. And there one may leave the matter, for no good would be done by enlarging on it.

These brief citations are designed to show that General Morgan is an ardent admirer of Morley, but one who guards himself from becoming an idolatrous worshipper. His appreciation is filled with intimate details which possess all the more value because Morley's friends can be depended upon to respect his injunction that no one should write his biography. There stands out from these pages the portrait of one who, besides being a scholar and a statesman, was humane to the point of "a tenderness passing the love of women". "He was no austere rationalist, impatient of human emotion. Cruelty fired his blood like a taunt; pity informed his whole outlook on life. Carved in bold letters on the granite mantelpiece of his library were the words, "The nobler a soul is, the more objects of Compassion it hath".

*Lord Minto: a Memoir.* By JOHN BUCHAN. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons; Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1924. Pp. xviii, 352. 21 s.)

MR. BUCHAN portrays Lord Minto with insight and sympathy—maintaining at the same time his own high standard of literary craftsmanship. It is clear that he has been inspired by his subject, as one can readily understand from the main features of the story itself. There are patrians and patricians. Shakespeare's Coriolanus represents one clear-cut type. But the Englishman or the Scot of manorial origin bears little resemblance to Coriolanus, or, for that matter, to Dante's Filippo Argenti. He is close to the land and its inhabitants. At his best he is a leader who is also sympathetic. He can be depended upon to be a good sportsman. Such was Minto—a man of native courage, kindliness, and capacity who was not found to be out of his part whether as a gentleman, jockey winning the French Grand National at Auteuil, or viceroy of India.

The Elliots had been lairds in Liddesdale long before a member of the sept became Earl of Minto. Thus the background of the family history is very much that which is supplied by *The Lay of the Last Minstrcl*. Mr. Buchan in fathoming the depths of Minto's character never forgets that he was a borderer:

He had indeed to the full the two strains which we have seen in his race—the speed and fire of the old Liddesdale Elliots, and the practical sagacity and balance of the Whig lords of Minto. It is a combination that is characteristic of the Borders, which were never prone to a narrow fanaticism, and which rarely lost a certain genial tolerance and a gift for mirthfulness and the graces of life.

Mr. Buchan's delineation of Minto's personal qualities is so vivid that one finds it difficult not to dwell upon this aspect of his book. For the historian, however, the high spots are those years of Minto's life which he spent in Canada as governor-general and in India as viceroy. Apparently it was his marriage in 1883 which turned him from racing and soldiering to a career of wider scope than that which he had marked out for himself

in his early youth. There can be no doubt that Lady Minto's part in prompting and inspiring her husband was of high moment. At any rate he grasped the skirts of happy chance by going to Canada, immediately after his marriage, as military secretary to Lord Lansdowne. His part in helping to suppress the Riel rising gave him a status among Canadians which rendered it appropriate that he should be named governor-general in 1898. And Canada proved a stepping-stone to India.

It is not unlikely that Mr. Buchan's account of Minto's relations with Sir Wilfrid Laurier and certain members of his Cabinet will occasion some debate in Canada, and there is a good deal to be said about his contacts with Lord Morley, who was in charge of the India Office during the greater part of the time when Minto was viceroy. Here we have no opportunity to discuss the points at issue beyond saying that Minto knew how to be firm without kindling personal antagonisms. For instance, in his correspondence with Morley "there was much stiffness and strenuous argument and much plain speaking. But it is no less necessary to emphasize the deep, underlying friendliness, the fundamental respect, sympathy, even affection of the two men for each other".

The effect of this book will be to heighten Minto's reputation very considerably. That he has been fortunate in his biographer is manifest. But the chief part of Mr. Buchan's function is to disclose powers much greater than those with which Minto has been credited heretofore and a character which was compounded of strength and gentleness.

*Western Civilization and the Far East.* By STEPHEN KING-HALL.  
(London: Methuen; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1924.  
Pp. xxv, 385. 18 s.)

THIS book has been written, its author states, "as a contribution toward the solution of the great problem" of achieving such co-operation and organization among nations that men may continue to exist "without the everlasting menace of war souring their life". "I do not write as a politician; I am in a profession where there are no politics" (pp. 3-4). The "foundations from which the investigations . . . will be conducted" are "the impressment of the West upon the Far East" and "the interrelationship of China and Japan" (p. 15). "I had hoped to be able to exclude . . . purely historical matter antecedent to very recent events", but "examination of the literature of this subject led me to the conclusion that . . . a concise and *impartial* statement of the historical foundation of the present political problems of the Far East was not to be found. I have endeavored to supply this want in my early chapters, but it is to the later chapters . . . that I attach any importance which the work may merit" (p. 10). At the end, "I am very well aware that some people will criticise what they will say is the unduly idealistic tendency of the book" (p. 343).

His attitude that of a political and social philosopher, his interest in present and future rather than past, Mr. King-Hall has gained his orienta-



tion and much of his information in the region concerning which (principally) he writes. He has relied much upon the leading British newspapers published in China and in Japan. An "assorted" bibliography of the Far East, carelessly compiled, with a foot-note wherein it is stated, "This list does not include all the books I have examined", suggests a recently acquired interest rather than a seasoned familiarity with the subject.

The book is so good and goes so far toward filling a long-felt want that the reviewer feels little inclined to inspect and check it for flaws. Some, however, will be stumbled over in passing. The historian will note a large number of errors in simple stating of fact: dates, for instance, have been dealt with most carelessly. Loose expressions, such as "foreign control" in reference to the Chinese maritime customs, and ambiguous terms, such as "China merchants", are unfortunate. The diversities of language and racial type in China have been overemphasized. With regard to political geography there is some confusion. The author's consistent disparagement of things American would be amusing were it not regrettable; his supreme confidence in the superiority of things British regrettable were it not amusing. He *almost* understands how it happened that at Paris the German rights in Shantung were transferred to Japan (see pp. 166 and 341). He has examined statistics, but does not like them and freely affirms it. Even so, why, in some cases, the figures used? If the texts of the first and second agreements of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance are to be given, why not that of the third? When stating that arms "have been supplied to factions in China from Germany . . . and Italy, whilst aircraft . . . have arrived from America", why leave out France and Japan?

Fortunately the book is not intended to be a history; nor is it a study of Western civilization; nor does it deal with the *whole* Far East. It is devoted in major portion to contemporary China and Japan. With regard to the past two decades of their history, the account which it gives is more complete and more illuminating than is to be found in any other volume which has come within the reviewer's purview. The author has studied carefully and has pondered deeply the social and political conditions within those two countries and he appears more sound with regard to them than with regard to situations and forces in the Occident. He realizes that at the bottom of the Far Eastern problem to-day and a part of it at every turn is the international treaty structure—though with the fabric of the system and with the historical whys and wherefores of the treaty provisions he does not ask his readers to be much concerned.

The chapter entitled China in Travail contains a masterly brief survey of Chinese politics since the revolution. Domestic Politics of Japan contains a clear account of forty years of domestic political strife in Japan, with characterizations of the principal political personalities. "Japan is a very special case in national development" (p. 310). Chapters on Japanese Policy in China since 1911 and on Japanese Policy in North Asia

are full of fact and suggestion. In the chapter on Shinto there is given the key to an understanding of the great dilemma which confronts the Japanese governing classes. The author observes, "it is certain that today (1924) Shinto amongst the masses is not entirely fulfilling the expectation of the government" (p. 292), but "if Shinto were modified to fit democracy it would be destroyed" (p. 294). For those who wish to distinguish between the true and the false in statements concerning the Far East, especially China, and in the news which emanates therefrom, the reviewer would emphatically recommend pages 313-314; for those who ask "When will China settle down?", pages 109-114; for an example of the author's keen appraisal of contemporary literature, the footnote on page 156.

Notwithstanding its somewhat journalistic character and its nationalistic bias, this book presents a wealth of information and its theorizing is stimulating and suggestive. It may well take precedence in the hands of the general reading public over certain volumes whose authors, more careful perhaps with regard to the trees, have seen the Far East forest in less sympathetic and accurate perspective than has Mr. King-Hall.

Query: Would a book of this type, printed first in New York, be given a Great Britain edition?

STANLEY K. HORNBECK.

*Tibet, Past and Present.* By Sir CHARLES BELL, K.C.I.E., C.M.G. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1924. Pp. xiv, 326. Maps. 24 s.)

In 1885 British relations with Tibet, begun in the time of Warren Hastings and thereafter discontinued, were reopened. Fifteen years later, Charles Bell, an experienced and devoted officer of the Indian civil service, began his contact with and study of India's northern neighbors. Thereafter, until 1922, this officer devoted his efforts and thought to the task of "securing" the frontier and establishing cordial relations between his own government and the governments of Bhutan, Nepal, and Tibet. In 1904 "Lord Curzon and the British government" despatched the Younghusband Expedition. The Tibetans resisted, and the Dalai Lama fled—to China. This expedition was "clearly the cause" of the later Chinese advance into Tibet. Lord Morley "lacked insight into the Tibetan question" and "abandoned the Tibetans to Chinese aggression". But a deliberate effort was being made by certain British officers to convince the Tibetans that the British were their friends. In 1910 when the Chinese invaded Tibet, the Dalai Lama fled—to India. By 1912 "sullen hostility was changed into cordial friendship" and "on the outbreak of the Great War . . . Tibet offered a contingent of troops to fight on the side of the British". In 1919 the Chinese government proposed that negotiations which had been broken off at Simla in 1914 be resumed. A Chinese mission went to Lhasa but accomplished nothing definite and, in

April, 1920, withdrew. In November of that year, at the invitation of the Dalai Lama, a British diplomatic mission reached Lhasa. This mission was entertained at the Tibetan capital for almost a year. Its chief was Sir Charles Bell.

With a knowledge of his subject probably unequalled by that of any other Occidental, master of the languages, familiar with the literatures, sympathetic toward and in the confidence of the peoples among whom he has labored, Sir Charles has written at once a history and an autobiography.

Four chapters are given to geography; four to history previous to 1904; at chapter IX. Sir Charles begins the account of the two decades in whose events he was himself a part. He tells his own story in his own way, describing expeditions, drawing pen-portraits, repeating conversations, explaining and discussing policies, tracing the course of negotiations and analyzing treaty provisions. Sikkim, Bhutan, and Tibet, the stage; India and China, the wings; Tibetans, British officials, and Chinese officials, the players; the wooing of Tibet, the problem. He devotes himself to these—let others write of other stages and other players; to what may have happened or what may be recorded in London, St. Petersburg, Moscow, and Tokyo, he gives little space and less evidence of concern; to the activities of Dorjiev and his subagents his treatment gives no prominence; to Kawaguchi and other Japanese he devotes a page; of German intrigue he speaks but once and briefly. To the contemporary literature of his subject he refers in a few foot-notes, citing by name English works only. In the appendixes there are printed the texts of a dozen treaties with and concerning Tibet. The photographic illustrations, nearly a hundred in number, are distinctive.

Tibet has been for a decade, Sir Charles insists, "*de facto* independent of China", and is now very cordially disposed toward Great Britain; this is a happy state of affairs, and "if matters are managed on our side with sympathy and foresight . . . may continue". Great Britain should "help the Tibetans . . . but in the main leave them free to live their own life, for that is about all they want". Toward "helping", he advocates the authorization of shipments to them of arms from British India.

This book will doubtless contribute substantially to the molding of British opinion with regard to Tibetan policy. The historian will value it as a first-class work, but in reference to some matters he will wish to have parallel accounts from Chinese and Tibetan and Russian sources. To the student of contemporary politics it will appeal as a trustworthy guide, and he will find in it eloquent testimony concerning what may be achieved in the realm of diplomacy by maintaining over a long period an intelligent and sympathetic personal contact.

STANLEY K. HORNBECK.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

*The History of Religion in the United States.* By HENRY KALLOCH ROWE, Ph.D., Professor of Social Science and History in the Newton Theological Institution. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1924. Pp. ix, 213. \$1.75.)

THIS little book seeks to give an interpretation, rather than a narrative history, of religion in the United States. It is intended for popular not technical use, and gives no documentation nor critical apparatus of any sort. Certain shortcomings seem inevitable in such a work. There are many vague statements such as "Methodists achieved minor reunion, and planned a major reunion between North and South which was long in coming" (p. 197). General characterizations must be employed, some of which are not altogether happy, e.g., "Mid-Victorian religion in America" applied to the period from about 1870 to about 1890 (pp. 122, 141). Occasionally nicknames are employed which are objected to by those to whom they are applied: "Campbellites" for the Disciples (p. 55). Summary statements are made which, taken by themselves, would be quite misleading: as, that the Church of England was an "ecclesiastical system that had been taken over without substantial change from Catholicism" (p. 18), and "most of their [Massachusetts settlers'] fellow Puritans had emigrated to the West Indies rather than to New England" (p. 27).

These difficulties, however, are to be expected in any work of this nature. If an historical interpretation of a movement is really needed and an intelligent interpretation supplied, the work justifies itself. Such is the case in the present instance. The religious element has been very inadequately treated in most of the writings published upon United States history; we have hardly made a beginning toward the understanding of religious development in America. Professor Rowe's sketch is therefore very welcome.

His interpretation may be briefly summarized, chiefly in his own words:

The significance of religion in American history has been its gradual emancipation from the institutionalism and tradition of the Old World. . . . Three phases of emancipation appeared in succession. The first phase was emancipation from the authority of a state church. . . . The second phase was emancipation from the formal worship and preaching of the earlier divines, and an inrush of emotional evangelism from the time of Wesley and Whitefield intermittently to Moody and the popular preachers of a half century ago. The third phase was emancipation from the traditional ideas of a Protestant orthodoxy, best represented by Calvin, beginning late in the eighteenth century and continuing with much controversy to the present time (pp. vii-viii).

Interwoven with this main line of interpretation are excellent estimates of the influence of the frontier, of the excessive individualism which pre-

vailed in the United States before the Civil War, and of the socializing and rationalizing tendencies of recent years.

Professor Rowe's interpretations are suggestive and, I believe, sound. Perhaps he underestimates the strength, or at least the bulk, of the Fundamental movement and of the Catholic Church. In some respects "emancipation" does not seem to have progressed so far in America as in the Old World; certainly it is Europe, not America, that has produced thinkers of conspicuous speculative power and freedom from dogma. On the other hand, the process by which, in America, religion has been put upon a voluntary basis, and the far-reaching, and often unsuspected, results of this religious "liberty", might have been developed more fully, even in a short sketch, than Professor Rowe has done. It is chiefly through this process that democratic ecclesiastical organization, unparalleled philanthropy, and uncouth forms of Christianity, all of them characteristic of America, have developed.

Jonathan Edwards's is the only personality which Professor Rowe makes stand out with any degree of clearness.

CHRISTOPHER B. COLEMAN.

*Legislative Assemblies: their Framework, Make-up, Character, Characteristics, Habits, and Manners.* [The Science of Legislation.] By ROBERT LUCE, A.M., LL.D. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1924. Pp. vi, 691. \$6.00.)

THIS work is unique in that its author has had the double advantage of not only being a widely read student of political science, but also of having enjoyed several years of practical experience as a member of state and federal legislative assemblies. This included nine years of service in the General Court of Massachusetts, and more recently service as a member of Congress. In addition he has held the important state office of lieutenant-governor and member of the governor's council, and chairman of the committee on rules and procedure of the constitutional convention of 1917-1919.

In the absence of a preface or introductory chapter in the volume under review, we turn to the publisher's statement of the plan and scope of the work. From this it appears that the present volume is the second in a series of four volumes that Mr. Luce proposes to contribute on *The Science of Legislation*, "treating historically, descriptively, and critically the legislative branch of government in every aspect". The first volume, on *Legislative Procedure*, was issued in 1922. The third and fourth volumes, to be published, will treat respectively of *Legislative Principles* and *Legislative Problems*. With the appearance of the present volume Mr. Luce already has accomplished one-half of the ambitious and elaborate task that he has projected.

*Legislative Assemblies*, as its secondary title indicates, deals with the framework, composition, and character of legislative bodies, but the gen-

eral title is much too broad to indicate the actual scope of the work. It is not a treatise on legislative assemblies in general, but rather on those in the United States and more especially on the lawmaking bodies of the states. Occasionally references are made to European legislative assemblies, both ancient and especially modern, even the most recently established ones, and analogies and contrasts are drawn with those of this country, but these are incidental and secondary. Mr. Luce discusses in considerable detail such topics as the bicameral system, the election of members, term and the rotation system, the frequency and length of sessions, numerical size, qualification for membership, contested elections, and kindred matters relating to the structure, composition, and other external aspects. Further, on the human side of lawmaking, the work considers such personal elements as the character and capacity of the members, their virtues and their limitations, with treatment of such topics as lobbying, bribery, log-rolling, privileges, decorum, salaries, and peculiar customs and practices.

The treatment frequently is too diffuse. The great number of facts presented, as well as the wealth of illustrations used, at times tends to obscure rather than to illuminate the main theme. There is lacking that keenness of analysis and clarity of presentation that characterized James Bryce's treatment of many of the same topics in his *American Commonwealth*. The author is familiar with the historical development of American legislative institutions and his work seems to the reviewer more valuable for its historical presentation than for its analytical and critical treatment of present-day institutions and problems. Mr. Luce, in this volume at least, apparently draws less upon his practical experience as a legislator than upon his knowledge of the literature of the subject. This is to be regretted.

It is difficult properly to appraise at its true worth the work of the author in this volume apart from the others in the series, inasmuch as certain subjects, the treatment of which might be expected, are either omitted or only casually mentioned. This may be explained because of the plan to reserve them for discussion in later volumes. However, it is singular that the relationship between the two houses is not more fully treated; that there is no discussion of the position and importance of the speaker and other presiding officers—the word "Speaker" is not found in the index. Moreover it is remarkable that the subject of "blocs" is omitted, and that there is no recognition given to the increasing importance of economic factors in relation to legislation. It is to be hoped that these and several other topics will not be overlooked in the forthcoming volumes.

HERMAN V. AMES.

*The Colonial Background of the American Revolution: Four Essays in American Colonial History.* By CHARLES M. ANDREWS, Farnam Professor of American History in Yale University. (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1924. Pp. x, 218. \$2.50.)

THE history of the English colonies in America is a great and important field of life, and in times past and just passing the truth about it has been a voice crying in the wilderness. It has been pre-empted by the patriotic partizan, the hero-worshipper, the democratic historian. It has been dealt with less for its own sake than as a sort of introduction to the national era. It has been visioned not broadly, but narrowly within the sky-line of local existence. It has been approached not with a temper judicial, but in a prejudiced spirit; even to-day it is not easy to exorcize the cherished prepossession that Britain is our historic foe. These attitudes and this stream of tendency may be explained; they are certainly hard to justify.

Time in its progress tends to correct the improper interpretations of the past. Recent historical scholarship has reconstructed our knowledge of the colonial period in a sound and wholesome manner. Detachment, a desire to explain and not to justify or glorify, a breadth of vision, a depth of knowledge gained by patiently seeking out and weighing all sources pertinent to the field—these are the qualities which modern scholars have brought to the problem of revealing the whole truth of colonial history. It is to the late Professor Osgood and George L. Beer and to Professor Andrews, now of Yale, that we owe a great debt of gratitude for correcting the narrowness of vision and the spirit of prejudice with which a former generation of historians were wont to deal with the colonies.

History is not to be fully understood in terms of a specially selected set of factors; the past is a complex fabric woven by the operation of many and varied forces. It used to be the fashion to treat the colonies almost wholly in the field of American history. That way was not wrong; fault lay not in what was told, but in what was left untold. It is the purpose of Professor Andrews in these four interpretative essays to show that "these years from 1607 to 1783 were colonial before they were American or national" and that to leave out of the reckoning the interactions and interrelations of colonies and mother country is to leave our understanding of colonial history "imperfect and incomplete". The pith of his thought is that the colonies were *colonies*, that the colonial relationship was an ever present reality to the colonists and never seriously questioned by them before 1763, and that to ignore or misjudge that relationship is to leave the problem of that history only half solved. The American Revolution itself was an attempt to solve the colonial relationship in response to new conditions, but the problem proved to be insoluble for the reason that there had grown up two separate peoples, two divergent



conceptions of life and of the state, one in England, the other in America, each in response to the law of their separate growth, which made it impossible for them to see eye to eye. This does not mean that he desires to rehabilitate solely the point of view of the mother country and to test the colonies by that criterion alone. He is fully aware, as his pages amply attest, that the colonies had a temper, a genius and character, of their own to be judged from within. It does mean that each side must be studied with equal thoroughness, with equal appreciation, and then only may colonial history in all its significance be rightly understood.

Professor Andrews would not claim that what he has written in this brief volume covers all of colonial history. The one great aim is to present a point of view, and this he has done in a definite and convincing manner. Such a book was needed, because it brings together in a concise and synthetic way the scattered knowledge of the colonies contributed by many recent scholars in the field. He comes to the task of giving a new breadth and a new significance to the colonial era with a depth of knowledge and mellowness of judgment won by long years of study in the field, by an intimacy with the sources, by writing, and by the stimulation and guidance of others in this field.

W. T. ROOT.

*Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1710-June, 1711, preserved in the Public Record Office.* Edited by CECIL HEADLAM, M.A., F. R. Hist. S. (London: H. M. Stationery Office. 1924. Pp. xlx, 684. 40 s.)

A NEW volume of the *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial*, is always welcome, and its perusal has somewhat the character of an exploration in the field of archaeology. One never knows what treasures are likely to be unearthed in the process of upturning the earth and throwing out spadefuls of relatively unimportant material, but one always hopes for finds of real value. At first sight some of the objects thus unearthed may not seem to be of much importance, but when they are taken in connection with other and similar objects they help to explain or complete lines of investigation already begun.

Under the plan of calendaring adopted in this series, we are given the opportunity, never enjoyed by old-time students of colonial history, of examining papers from many widely scattered governmental collections and so of viewing movements as wholes or approximately as wholes and of being able to see what was going on in all the colonies at the same time. As long as writers are satisfied to study the records of a single colony or of a single group of colonies, they are bound to be content, for the most part, with only partial views of their subject and thus to base their conclusions on an incomplete and restricted survey of the evidence. But as documents illustrating all the activities of the British government in its relations with the entire group of colonies, from Newfoundland to

Barbados, become known and are made available for comparative study, the colonial scene will undergo important changes and we shall view the colonies in quite a different perspective. What possible chance is there of understanding colonial history when we study the documents of but a single colony or limit our interest to the continental group only! It is the great merit of this series to render obsolete such an old-fashioned method of dealing with our subject.

Study of the present volume will not be rewarded by results of great consequence. The time was one of good feeling in the main, with warfare chiefly confined to the West Indies and the continental colonies troubled by little of a disturbing character, except the Canadian expedition and the capture of Port Royal. Regarding these events not much that is new is added here. But as we advance into the eighteenth century we shall find ourselves entering a world hitherto little explored. The present volume closes with June 29, 1711. Two years later the Treaty of Utrecht was signed, and probably the next volume will carry us forward to this important event, which caused division in the ranks of the mercantilists because of the commercial agreements that Arthur Moore made with France. Now the fact remains that except for war happenings less is known of the years from 1713 to 1763 than of any other period of colonial history, so that every volume of the *Calendar* that appears from now on is likely to have unusual value. This period of fifty years is significant because it shows us the old British system of control in comparatively peaceful operation. Even though the period was one of warfare, it was, as far as the relations with the mother country were concerned, one of normal development. Such a period is always better for a study of a system than is one of beginnings, as was that before 1689, or of crisis, as was that after 1763. Every volume henceforth issued should add greatly to what we know of British policy and should render our estimates of the relationship better balanced and more accurate.

Mr. Headlam's preface to this volume contains an excellent epitome of the most important events and offers few opportunities for special comment. He fails to notice, however, one bit of interesting information, not hitherto certainly known, to the effect that the £16,000 due to William Penn was for his father's "disbursements in the Victualling Office" and not, as some of our witless historians would have us believe, for the payment of the king's gambling debts. Furthermore, the editor does not call attention to the fact that a considerable number of documents, here printed in full, are already available either in the *New York Colonial Documents*, the *Maryland Archives*, or the *Spotswood Letters*. In section 300 appears the title "Secry. of War", a manifest error on the part of some contemporary copying-clerk for "Secretary at War". The same slip occurs in other entry-books of the Colonial Office series, but I have never seen it in an original document. There was, of course, no "Secretary of War" at this time. Mr. Headlam uses indiscriminately "Council of

Trade" and "Board of Trade" in his preface, and in consequence, at the top of page xxv, gets badly tangled up in his use of the word "Council".

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

*A History of the Foreign Policy of the United States.* By RANDOLPH GREENFIELD ADAMS, Ph.D., Custodian of the William L. Clements Library of American History, University of Michigan. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1924. Pp. xviii, 490. \$3.50.)

THIS work is designed as a brief survey "of the history of our foreign relations". The author wishes to "popularize our knowledge of the subject" or, as he further explains, to "epitomize the results of research in the field" in such a way as to make these results intelligible to any reader. The plan has involved him in the writing of eighteen chapters of a narrative subdivided, for clearness of analysis, into sixty-nine topical headings. There are in addition seventeen maps, seven portraits (chosen with discrimination), and an appendix (pp. 441-450) consisting of a selected bibliography and a list, arranged chronologically, of the secretaries of state (1789-1924), with dates of their respective commissions. By way of introduction a general chapter on International Relations precedes some account of early American diplomacy prior to the Revolution. There follows an attempt to cover the intricate story of our foreign affairs down to 1924.

A cursory reading of the narrative leaves a general impression that the author has failed to make either an adequate or a clear distinction between foreign affairs and foreign policy. Foreign affairs is a widely extended and far-reaching domain over the circumstances of which no single government has anything but partial control. Policy, on the other hand, may be likened to a national trail, which is clearly marked from time to time by treaties, laws, or agreements, all of these consciously and more or less carefully formulated, precisely dated, and based upon somewhat generally acknowledged principles. This trail, dependent upon national or international circumstances, is of course frequently modified or altered by changes in them. Had Dr. Adams made this distinction clear before embarking upon his theme, he could probably have reduced the length of his text, or at any rate have dwelt upon several topics which now find no place in the book.

The author's grasp of international law is not sufficiently firm to save him from misleading statements (pp. 366 ff.) about contraband of war and from questionable notions regarding the significance at various stages of our policy of isolation considered in relation to the Monroe Doctrine. In a book of this sort it could hardly be expected that the writer would make any wide use of sources. Dr. Adams's failure, however, to consult at times even the more accessible sources has got him into a large number of minor inaccuracies. He has not read critically even the monographic

literature on the subject, as anyone may discover who chooses to check up his quotations. There can be no doubt that he has read widely, if not carefully—especially in the more recent contributions to his subject. But the “uncharted eddies of current speculation” have occasionally swung the author off the course followed by able and qualified experts. The style of writing, rather consciously designed to be fluent and free, is frequently slovenly; and now and again observations and opinions can only be termed flippant. Proof-reading has been exceedingly careless.

Early in his narrative (p. 21), Dr. Adams makes this assertion: “the idea that America can stay out of European affairs has no basis in fact, for America never has done so from the time of the Spanish Armada to the Treaty of Versailles in 1919.” Somewhat further along, at the conclusion of a passage bearing upon neutrality and our relations to France during the French Revolution (p. 94), we read that “the new nation was asserting and maintaining its right to remain neutral in the first great European War which it had been able to stay out of for more than a century”. Without more of an explanation than is anywhere to be found, this sort of reasoning will lead to confusion in the mind of any careful reader. While it is true that since 1898 our traditional attitude toward a policy of strict isolation has been modified, there is little ground, as Dr. Adams knows (p. 363), for implying that the force of the tradition has been either forgotten or ignored. It is to-day, as it always has been, our national policy to keep clear from political entanglements with European countries. It is going quite beyond the evidence to declare that Simón Bolívar “was insistent that the United States should be invited” (p. 181) to the Panama Congress of 1826. Secretary Seward was careful *not* to “cite the Monroe Doctrine” (p. 198) against French efforts (1861–1867) to sustain Maximilian’s occupancy of Mexico. Even in Seward’s two most striking communications (the famous letter of February 12, 1866, and his sharp despatch of November 23 following, addressed to John Bigelow) there is not a word about that doctrine. In his implication that the steamer *Trent* was bound for Liverpool in November, 1861, the author has overlooked the fact that her destination was the island of St. Thomas; there Mason and Slidell intended to tranship to Southampton—facts which Charles Francis Adams made clear in “The Trent Affair”, a paper very properly cited by Dr. Adams as one of the authorities on which he appears to have relied (pp. 237–238). Again, in discussing the history of the purchase of Alaska (pp. 245–248), he could have avoided several misstatements had he read carefully “The Purchase of Alaska”, an article (which he cites) written by Professor Frank A. Golder for this *Review* (XXV, 411–425). In treating the well-worn subject of the Ostend Manifesto (October 18, 1854), Dr. Adams should have stated in fairness to his reader precisely what the attitude of Secretary W. L. Marcy was toward that extraordinary paper. This he does not do (pp. 265–266), although he must have known that Marcy, in the name of President Pierce, disavowed the policy therein set forth. To say that Roosevelt

"from the start" (p. 382) felt that we should be in the war on the side of the Allies is an error, unless we are to overlook Mr. Roosevelt's striking plea in his *Outlook* article (September 23, 1914) for the support of President Wilson's stand for strict neutrality.

A characteristic weakness of the author's narrative is his almost inveterate disregard of dates. His treatment of Washington's policy of neutrality (pp. 82-89) may be termed adequate. But a good many readers will be surprised to find that throughout nearly seven pages given to that subject Dr. Adams has nowhere stated the year (1793) during which that policy was determined upon or given the date (April 22) of the famous proclamation on which it rested. The "great hurricane" (p. 262) of March 16, 1889—a tidal wave which created havoc to the shipping off the harbor of Apia in the Samoan group—had no appreciable influence with respect to the summoning by Bismarck of a conference of certain powers at Berlin early in the summer of that year. This Dr. Adams could easily have discovered by consulting President Cleveland's special message to the Senate of February 27, 1889; by that time the conference plan was all but completely matured. President Garfield's death (p. 309), on September 19, 1881, had nothing to do with the failure of Secretary Blaine to assemble in 1882 a Pan-American conference. The invitations to the proposed gathering were sent out on November 29, 1881. The continuance of the so-called "War of the Pacific" made its assembling inadvisable.

These eighteen chapters leave the impression of a series of systematized topics—the beginnings of a work that should, after careful maturing of thought, have been welded together into a useful book. In its present shape the narrative is loosely done and so careless as to jeopardize the understanding of a highly important subject.

HENRY BARRETT LEARNED.

*A History of the Public Land Policies.* By BENJAMIN HORACE HIBBARD, Ph.D., Professor of Agricultural Economics in the University of Wisconsin and Research Associate in the Institute for Research in Land Economics and Public Utilities. [Land Economics Series, edited by Richard T. Ely, LL.D.] (New York: Macmillan Company, 1924. Pp. xix, 591. \$4.50.)

THE aim of this volume is to present a complete "sketch of the historical development and operations of our federal land policies". The first five chapters deal with the period to 1820, covered by Treat, *The National Land System*. A careful comparison of portions of Hibbard's chapter III. and Treat's publications reveals the fact that Hibbard follows Treat topic by topic, paraphrasing and quoting without proper acknowledgment. A typical example of paraphrasing is the following: "The Ordinance [1785] did indeed lay down great general principles which have run through our entire land policy" (p. 40). Treat's language is: "it

laid down great principles of action which have continued in operation to the present time" (*American Historical Association Report*, 1905, vol. I, p. 238). Three cases of quoting are on page 36.

Chapters VI. to XVII. deal mainly with the years 1820 to 1862 and give successive chronological treatments of the cash sales system, military bounty lands, pre-emption, distribution of the proceeds of the public lands, cession, claim associations, speculation, land grants for internal improvements and education, graduation, and homestead. This organization of material is open to the serious objection that it is difficult to put interacting measures like pre-emption, graduation, cession, distribution, and homestead into water-tight compartments without repetition or loss of clarity. Especially is this so as the author attempts to give the sectional and political aspects of these issues. For example, Clay's report on public lands, 1832, is considered in the treatment of distribution, cession, and graduation. Hibbard admits that cession "figured prominently in the debates concerning graduation, distribution, and homesteads" (p. 192).

The middle part of this book can not be entrusted to students nor serve as a basis for further investigation because of the many errors of fact and conclusion. Important examples of corrigenda are the following: the Whig party did not endorse pre-emption in the election of 1840 (p. 156); the Senate debate on Benton's bill in the 26th Congress, second session, was not "a mere love feast" (p. 157); the Senate vote on distribution-pre-emption in 1841 was strictly partizan (p. 158); Jackson's favorable recommendation on public lands was not "early in his presidency" (p. 177), but on December 4, 1832; the alliance of South and West on public lands and tariff, 1830 to 1832, is not understood, nor the position of Calhoun in relation to these issues in 1833, 1836, and 1841 (pp. 184-186, 193), nor that of Hayne in 1830 (p. 354); it is not true that Tyler wholeheartedly favored distribution in 1841 (pp. 186, 187), as may be seen in his message in which he recommended it only if it did not mean a higher tariff than had been intended by the compromise of 1833; the Senate debate on the Homestead Bill in 1854 was not "desultory" (p. 371). Lack of space prevents reference to twenty-seven other errors noted. In addition to the many errors there are important omissions: the championship by Governor Edwards of the right of the Western states to public lands within their limits, the debate on Hunt's distribution resolution in 1830, the passage of Clay's distribution bill by the Senate, 1832, the pre-emption statute of 1840, and distribution as an aid to the debtor states in the 26th Congress. Hibbard apparently does not know Stephenson, *The Political History of the Public Lands, 1840 to 1862*, as there is no reference to it in bibliography or foot-notes. Stephenson furnishes significant material which should have been included in this book.

Hibbard cultivates a virgin field in his treatment of the public land policy since 1862, considering the operation of the Homestead Act, the disposal of timber and mineral lands, irrigation and reserved lands. This

is a real contribution to knowledge. A topical table of contents, an index, chapter summaries, and numerous tables are helpful.

RAYNOR G. WELLINGTON.

*The Austin Papers.* Edited by EUGENE C. BARKER. Parts I. and II. [Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1919, vol. II.] (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1924. Pp. vii, 1008; 1009-1824. \$1.25.)

THESE two substantial tomes constitute the first offerings from the Austin Papers. In point of time and content they and the volume that is to follow will take a place alongside of the *Texas Diplomatic Correspondence*, edited by the late George P. Garrison and published under the same auspices. Naturally the present work differs greatly from the earlier publication. The Austins, father and son, were substantial men of affairs who were permitted to play a conspicuous part on the Western frontier in two interesting periods of transition. Moses Austin reached what is now Missouri a few years before it was annexed to the United States. Some twenty years later, he proposed to introduce American colonists into Texas, just before the plan of Iguala went into effect. His more noted son, Stephen F. Austin, was present in Mexico City during Iturbide's rule and the adoption of a republican form of government. Of these determinative events he was more than a mere spectator, for the project of a constitution appearing in the present work (pp. 601-627) bears his name. Like his father, he was always in touch with the prominent actors of his vicinage.

But the great services of the Austins were in behalf of American colonization in Texas. Four-fifths of the material herewith presented relates to this enterprise during the years 1820-1827. Of this movement Stephen F. Austin was both political and fiscal leader and in these pages we find evidence of his myriad activities. Few men in similar circumstances have been more serviceable than he. Called to administer an alien system of law and of landholding, among a population accustomed to little system or method, he achieved his difficult task with a minimum of friction and with marked satisfaction to most of those concerned.

Numerous as are the legal and administrative documents and the items of business procedure, often apparently of trivial importance, the material of human interest is surprisingly large. One speedily learns that Maria Austin is both prayerful and solicitous for the safety of her much wandering husband and sons and that they have a tender regard for her happiness and comfort. The father, we understand, occasionally displays an excess of temper and even the level-headed Stephen narrowly avoids a duel. There are a few references to boyish aspirations and to fleeting youthful companionship, but one's chief impression is of continuous effort, of responsibility early assumed and steadily maintained, of piety and of frugality, of buoyant hope and of frequent unmerited disappoint-



ment. Taken as a whole the collection, made up of letters from men of every walk in life, affords a very satisfactory picture of the Western frontier a century ago, with its need of daily toil and sacrifice.

Most of the material comes from the collection presented to the University of Texas some twenty-five years ago by the heirs of Colonel Guy M. Bryan, a grandson of Moses Austin. This has been supplemented by selections from other Texas repositories and occasional letters from more distant sources. Professor Barker's work as editor has been taxing but exceedingly well done. There is a calendar of the papers herewith offered as well as of the few previously printed. We shall await with interest the appearance of the concluding volume.

I. J. Cox.

*Robert E. Lee, the Soldier.* By Major-General Sir FREDERICK MAURICE. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1925. Pp. xi, 313. Map. \$4.00.)

THE career of Lee has been attractive to the British. Wolseley, Henderson, Fremantle, Chesney, and now Sir Frederick Maurice, high examples of the brain of the British army in the last sixty-five years, have joined in his praise. Some of this has been due no doubt to sympathy for the effort to break the union of our cantankerous colonies, but mostly was it due to a generous pride in the deeds of a noble representative of their own race. So we too must feel, whether we be of the North or of the South, now that we have lived to forget the howling dervishes of both sides, who started the trouble. And we may strongly believe that Robert E. Lee, if he had lived a few years longer, would have joined with one of his brilliant subordinates, General E. P. Alexander, who had no apologies to make but said twenty-three years ago at the centennial of the West Point Military Academy, "it is best for the South that the cause was lost. The right to secede, the stake for which we fought so desperately, were it now offered as a gift we would reject as we would reject a proposition of suicide".

Sir Frederick briefly summarizes his estimate of Lee in two paragraphs. Of the campaign of 1862 he says that his operations are "supreme in conception and have not been surpassed, as examples of strategy, by any other achievement of their kind by any other commander in history". "The Campaign of the Wilderness, of Spottsylvania and the North Anna is a classical example of how these objects should be sought. In method it was fifty years ahead of the time." To this clear statement of the primacy of Lee in offensive and defensive war it might have been added that his choice of a forest for a battle-ground was another original conception in modern war. Furthermore the author gives a carefully considered estimate in which he rates Lee above Wellington as a general.

But while General Maurice gives Lee a place in the select band of great commanders he is strong in his criticisms. In considering how just

they are it is well to notice certain tendencies of military writers in such cases. Success calls for approval and failure is condemned. Thus Napoleon has credit for success which he owes to his "lucky star", and some of his greatest victories came from the happy inspiration of subordinates. It was not so with Lee. The battle orders and instructions of Lee may be said to have been loose or vague or to have provided for too many alternatives too far in advance, but the systematic issue of orders was invented at a later day. Those of Lee will stand well beside those of Napoleon at Bautzen, at Wagram, at Jena and Auerstadt, and in the Waterloo campaign.

When we consider the dispersion of Lee's army in the Gettysburg campaign we must remember that Meade's army was more dispersed, that Meade's despatches show that this was due to the fact that Stuart's cavalry was detached from the main body, that Lee concentrated on the flank of Meade at Gettysburg, that he got the most men there first. Moreover, Lee was supplying his army in the country of his enemy.

As to the failure of Lee to control Longstreet it might have been answered that if he could have found a better corps commander he would have done so, and that even Jackson failed him once.

In passing our judgment upon the charge of Pickett on July 3, it is well to see if there was justification in the events of the previous day. On July 2 Wright's Georgia Brigade of 1200 men made identically the same attack, under less favorable conditions, pierced the centre, held it for a short time, captured guns, lost fifty killed and wounded, and had to go back because he was not supported. The failure of the supports on both occasions was not Lee's failure.

EBEN SWIFT.

*Selections from the Correspondence of Theodore Roosevelt and Henry Cabot Lodge, 1884-1918.* In two volumes. (New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1925. Pp. vi, 546; 573. \$10.00.)

THE pace set by these letters which passed between Theodore Roosevelt and Henry Cabot Lodge is indicated by the salutations and dates of some of the earliest written by Mr. Roosevelt: May 5, 1884, "My dear Mr. Lodge"; May 25, "Dear Lodge"; November 7, "Dear old fellow"; November 11, "Dear Cabot." All the correspondence in volume I. comes within the years 1884 and 1902, being bounded on the one side by the Cleveland-Blaine campaign and on the other by the coal strike of 1902. Volume II. covers the years 1903-1918.

Both volumes indicate the extraordinary number of unworthy people with whom Mr. Roosevelt came into conflict. Such were "those political and literary hermaphrodites the mugwumps", "whose lies are predestined to rot in forgotten obscurity" (I. 51, 82); John Wanamaker who "indulged in needless lying, thanks to his sloppy-mindedness," (I. 115); the

"scoundrelly chief", Edwin Godkin, of the *Nation* (I. 130); "that prattling creature" Edward Atkinson ("I mean just to dress him down incidentally"), who "combines the imagination of a green grocer with the heart of a Bengalee baboo" (I. 133, 139); and Carl Schurz—"I don't care what that prattling foreigner shrieks or prattles in this crisis" (I. 422, Mr. Schurz having then—1899—been an American since before "T. R." was born).

The historian who has been inclined to put a slight value on the accomplishments of President Benjamin Harrison will find himself matched by Harrison's fighting civil service commissioner. In the early days of Roosevelt's period of service on the commission, he was inclined to see much virtue in his chief. As time went on, however, the natures of the men clashed. Roosevelt wished to move quickly and hit hard. Harrison wished, apparently, to avoid any controversy. "Oh, Heaven, if the President had a little backbone, and if the Senators did not have flannel legs!"; "I had a very short and cold interview with the President"; "It is horribly disheartening to work under such a Chief" (I. 101, 104, 116, 123). All these defects in the President highly irritated a commissioner who declared himself even as early as September 30, 1894, "rugged as a bull moose".

Perhaps the newest bit of historical information in volume I. is the succession of letters which shows how shrewdly and carefully Henry Cabot Lodge groomed his friend Theodore for political preferment. Hearing from Roosevelt, for example, in 1895 that he was contemplating an attack on the machine in New York, Lodge cabled from Paris to be cautious and followed up his message with a letter full of sage advice. He counselled the energetic police commissioner to "be *very regular*" (the italics are the senator's). "At all events say nothing and make no attack until I see you" (I. 197). Not by accident did President McKinley choose Roosevelt as assistant secretary of the navy, nor without a carefully prepared campaign of supporting recommendations and personal interviews engineered by the sagacious senator.

Politically, of course, this prescience appears to greatest advantage in 1900 just before the Republican convention of that year which eventually nominated Roosevelt for the vice-presidency. Both Lodge and Roosevelt were greatly concerned as to exactly the effect that such a move would have on the future. The colonel, as is well known, did not wish to be shelved in a position of innocuous desuetude. "It would not entertain me to preside in the Senate. I should be in a cold shiver of rage at inability to answer hounds like Pettigrew. . . . I could not *do anything*" (I. 448).

Senator Lodge, however, was looking ahead. Not for him, either, the idea of dignified ease. The vice-presidency, he argued, would be merely a stage, an incident, in the political progress of his friend. "My belief in your taking it [the vice-presidential nomination] arises from my conviction that it is the true stepping stone for you either toward the Presidency or the Governor Generalship of the Philippines" (I. 444).

After the nomination to the vice-presidency and during the campaign, more long-headed advice. President McKinley was to remain in Washington, rather than make speaking tours, because of the requirements of the dignity of his office. Roosevelt was to go out on the stump. He must appear, urged his mentor, simply as a leading advocate of McKinley, not as one who would "absorb the leadership and the glory" for himself. Thus neither the President nor his friends would have any cause for jealousy, and thus would the future be cared for. "I believe myself", wrote Cabot on June 29, 1900, "that by judicious conduct we can have it [the presidency] just as surely within our grasp four years hence as it would be today, but we should make no mistakes" (I. 468). Shrewd Cabot!

Volume II. contains possibly more bits of information that add distinctly to our knowledge of recent events.

In the first place, there are President Roosevelt's confidential notes about the American tender of good offices in the Russo-Japanese War. It appears that the Japanese first requested Roosevelt to take steps toward peace: "they desired the request made, but desired that it should be on my own motion and that they should not in any shape or way appear as asking it" (II. 131).

Roosevelt's enjoyment in the possession of the presidential office is well known. Not so well known are his misgivings about his statement of 1904 that under no circumstances would he accept another nomination. Apparently the Republican nominating convention of 1908 aroused a little desire to be again in the ring: "Of course there have been uncomfortable moments when I have felt very doubtful as to whether I had not by my action deserved a place beside your Dante's Pope, who was guilty of the great renunciation" (II. 304).

Most interesting of all is the growing rift in the Republican party during Taft's administration, typified in a similar difference of opinion between Roosevelt and Lodge. As early as four days after Taft's inauguration, Roosevelt expressed a somewhat pained surprise that Taft removed Henry White, the American ambassador to France, and that he did not reappoint all of Roosevelt's Cabinet (II. 329). In 1910 Lodge upheld Taft in the removal of Pinchot (II. 358). From that time on, the burden of the correspondence was an attempt on the part of each of the writers to convince himself and the other that there was no fundamental difference in their positions on the political situation. The attempt was a failure. Lodge refused to take part in the election of 1912 on Roosevelt's side, but felt constrained by friendship not to take any part against him.

There is humor, of a sort, in the unfeigned joy with which the two friends joined hands again in the attack on Woodrow Wilson—Wilson, "with his adroit, unscrupulous cunning, his readiness to about-face, his timidity about any manly assertion of our rights, and his pandering to the feelings of those who love ease . . . his hypocrisy, his inefficiency, his rancorous partisanship, and his selfish eagerness to sacrifice all patriotic

considerations to whatever he thinks will be of benefit to himself politically" (II, 478, 525).

Despite the fact that many of Roosevelt's hostile judgments of other men were based on a rather obvious personal antipathy and even petty partizanship, the student of American history since 1884 will have to take account of almost every page of these two volumes.

CHARLES R. LINGLEY.

*History of Virginia. Volume I. Colonial Period, 1607-1763. By PHILIP ALEXANDER BRUCE, LL.D. Volume II. The Federal Period, 1763-1861. By LYON GARDINER TYLER, LL.D., President Emeritus of the College of William and Mary. Volume III. Virginia since 1861. By RICHARD L. MORTON, Ph.D., College of William and Mary. (Chicago and New York: American Historical Society, Incorporated,<sup>1</sup> 1924. Pp. lxxi, 424; 542; 421.)*

THESE three volumes were prepared to accompany three volumes of biographical sketches of living Virginians issued by the same publishing company. There has been no general survey of the history of Virginia since the publication of John Esten Cooke's *Virginia* in 1883, in the *American Commonwealths* series, a book that was inadequate at the time it was written and is of course extremely inadequate after the lapse of forty years. Fiske's *Old Virginia and her Neighbors*, published in 1897, brings the story down only to 1753. Beverley's *History and Present State of Virginia*, appearing in 1705, is indispensable for the events of the hundred years after the first settlement of Virginia. Stith's *History*, published in 1747, a standard work and admirable so far as it goes, does not extend beyond the period of the London Company. John Daly Burk had finished his third volume of the *History of Virginia*, bringing the narrative down to the beginning of the Revolution, when he was killed in a duel. Skelton Jones and L. H. Girardin extended this history to the end of the Revolution in what is known as the fourth volume of Burk. Howison, in his *History of Virginia to the Present Time*, brought his account down to the date of publication of the second volume, 1847, but the period after the Revolution was most imperfectly treated, with little use of newspapers and manuscript records. Charles Campbell's *History of the Colony and Ancient Dominion of Virginia*, dated 1860, ending with the close of the Revolution, remains useful for the period it covers, though of course the investigations of sixty-five years have made parts of it of little value. There was therefore a real need of a history, covering the three hundred years of Virginia's development, written in the light of the many documents recently uncovered and of the many studies of particular men, incidents, and periods published in the past forty years. Dr. Philip A.

<sup>1</sup> A publishing company, to be carefully distinguished from the American Historical Association. Ed.

Bruce accepted the responsibility of editor-in-charge. He planned the history in three periods, with a different writer for each. After the sudden death of Dr. Alfred J. Morrison, who had begun work on the volume for the years 1860-1920, Dr. Richard L. Morton of the College of William and Mary was asked to undertake the third period. His work is entirely independent of what Dr. Morrison had finished at the time of his death.

In the first volume, after preliminary chapters on the Motives behind the Colonization of Virginia, the Virginia Company, the Physical Aspects of Aboriginal Virginia, and the Indians, which are excellent summaries of our information on these subjects, the author begins at once with the expedition of 1607, omitting detailed mention of Raleigh and of the navigators between Raleigh and the founding of Jamestown. This omission will be generally approved. The reader can not fail to observe the judicious and fair treatment of the disputed questions of this early period. The author takes no partizan attitude. He does justice to Smith, to Dale, and to all other leaders. Even in Harvey's case, he is open-minded, evidently believing that there was always something to be said in behalf of a colonial governor. Dr. Bruce does not fail to present whatever claims Governor Berkeley may have had for the gratitude of Virginians of his time. This does not deter him from denouncing Berkeley's tyranny, obstinacy, and narrow-mindedness. The discussion of Bacon's Rebellion is one of the best we have of the turbulent year 1676. Dr. Bruce is at his best in chapter XXXIV., Economic and Social Conditions, and chapter XXXV., Institutional Conditions. The chapters relating to the administrations of Nott, Spotswood, Drysdale, Gooch, and Dinwiddie do not reach the high standard of the first half of the book. There are very few annotations. The bibliography could be very much improved by complete titles.

Dr. Tyler's well-known attainment in the details of the Revolutionary struggle in Virginia and the other colonies and his familiarity with the general political conditions in the nation and state after the Revolution to the beginning of the Civil War amply qualified him to write the second volume, the history from 1763 to 1860, a period which has never before been treated in a general way. In order to prepare the reader for the Revolution, it was necessary to review some of the incidents of the administrations of Gooch, Dinwiddie, and Fauquier. If one wishes a clear account of the Parsons Cause, written in the light of all recent studies on the subject, he will find it in chapter III. In the chapters on the preliminaries of the Revolution and on the Revolution itself it is at once evident that the author believes that Virginia's loyal support to the other colonies and her sacrifices throughout the Revolution have not been recognized in their full value. Any candid student of the archives and literature relating to the subject, familiar with the topography of Virginia and knowing its economic conditions in 1775 to 1781, can not fail to agree in the main with Dr. Tyler. A perusal of chapters IV. and V. of part II., Contributions of Virginia to the American Revolution, and Reforms in the Law,

may be recommended to every student of the Revolution. The later chapters of this volume might be termed a "History of the United States and Virginia". It is true that the nation and state are so interrelated that it would be impossible to write of Virginia's history of this period without considerable discussion of the country in general. We believe, however, that Dr. Tyler has sacrificed much for the benefit of these chapters. He has lacked space to give us a connected story of the long struggle for a revision of the first constitution, of the convention of 1829-1830, of the effort for another convention, of the convention that finally convened in 1850, and of its constitution. There is no thorough discussion of the questions of suffrage, representation, the east and west in the state, and internal improvements, all more or less connected with the efforts to revise the first and second constitutions. What discussion there is of these questions has been relegated to an appendicatory chapter which contains a summary of the leading events of each governor's administration.

Volume III., *History of Virginia since 1861*, is by Dr. Richard L. Morton. Chapter I. is a review of the campaigns of both armies in Virginia in the War of Secession. The author has wisely subordinated, in length of treatment, the years 1861-1865 to the years of reconstruction and readjustment. Preceding the account of the restored government at Alexandria and the beginning of reconstruction, is a brief chapter on the Wheeling government. Of the nightmare period 1865 to 1870, the author writes impartially, presenting the views of all the different factions and parties. The various attempts at compromise projected by the ablest men of the state and which finally led to the election of Gilbert C. Walker are described and evaluated. The author believes that Walker's nomination and election was a fortunate circumstance for the state. Of the turmoil known as readjusterism and Mahoneism, the author gives an account based on extensive research. He has studied the newspapers, the printed documents, and the archives, and consequently has copiously annotated his pages. His description of the rise of the public-school idea and of its development under Ruffner and his successors is one of the most satisfactory accounts of education in this period in Virginia. Good seed had been sown for general public education in the decade preceding the war, and the state was therefore friendly to the idea, even in the midst of all its poverty and political confusion and notwithstanding the general outline of the plan had been adopted by the unpopular convention of 1867-1868. In the preparation of these chapters on education, Dr. Morton has had the advantage of consultation with several educators of that period who are now living. Due credit is given to all who yielded their best efforts to advance education, whether from the North or South. The volume is written in the historical spirit, in an unpartizan way, and will lead to a true understanding of this period of Virginia history. The closing chapters form a rapid survey of some of the social and economic factors in the rebuilding of the Old Dominion. A more detailed account of the agriculture of Virginia for the past sixty years and a more extensive discus-



sion of the convention of 1901-1902 would add much to the value of this volume.

The authors have undoubtedly had to submit to limitations imposed upon them by the form of publication necessary for the three accompanying biographical volumes. The volumes are in quarto, heavy and unwieldy. The illustrations have not always been carefully selected, and some have not been clearly reproduced. There is no index to each volume. Instead, a general index to the six volumes of the complete work is inserted at the beginning of volume I., an unlikely place for an investigator to find it. There is no table of contents in the separate volumes, but a general table of the three volumes is in the first volume. There are errors due to careless proof-reading. There is a lack of uniform quality in the chapters of each volume, some having been prepared with much more care than others. We understand that each author intends to reprint his volume in octavo form, carefully revised and expanded, with annotations, bibliographical appendix, and a complete index. In their present form the three volumes answer a useful and necessary purpose; with revision and enlargement, and publication in octavo, they will reach numerous readers and will receive that general attention they deserve, for they give us the only continuous history of Virginia we have at the present

E. G. SWEM.

#### MINOR NOTICES

*L'Italie Primitif et les Débuts de l'Impérialisme Romain.* Par Léon Homo, Professeur à l'Université de Lyon. [L'Évolution de l'Humanité, ed. Henri Berr, no. 16.] (Paris, La Renaissance du Livre, 1925, pp. xiii, 439, 20 fr.) The impression which one obtains from a careful reading of this volume is pleasure at the lucidity with which the author has conceived and expressed his thought of Italian history. The development from prehistoric times is so clear in the mind of M. Homo that he can not fail to make it intelligible to others. This is not done with disregard of the evidence. Although Homo lacks the particularity of certain German writers, he appears to meet frankly all the significant opinions published on his problems. This is shown by the number of his foot-note references and the length of the bibliography given at the end of the volume. He has, to be sure, a tendency to look at questions in their "grand lines", as he expresses it; and to fail occasionally to fill in the picture so as to make it seem organic; but he seldom falls into inconsistency or disregard of the causal relation of events. His is a book of interpretations.

To some of his conclusions, and perhaps to his method of work, scholars may take exception. The very middle course which he follows in the interpretation of the history of Italy prior to the revolt from the Etruscans at the end of the sixth century will displease both extremes. Yet his conclusions have much to commend them. Although the idea of a prehistoric Central European empire does not convince even the general

editor of the series, the major portion of the discussion gives an intelligible picture of the beginnings of life in Italy. The coming of the Etruscans, the problems concerning their history, and their creation of a strong group of states are told in a convincing fashion. The same praise can be given to his account of the relations of Rome to the other peoples of central Italy prior to the Latin revolt of 338 B. C., and to the survey of the steps by which Rome was led first to conquer Italy and then to meet the problems of the Tyrrhenian and Adriatic seas.

Three points of method suggest themselves for consideration. The tendency to reduce all questions to a geographical basis seems to neglect the possibility that human will may interfere with what we of to-day would consider the natural or proper decision to make. Thus, his argument in support of the Septimontium is based very largely on his notion of what the "lay of the land" would demand of the inhabitants. To this bias is joined an excess of confidence in the certainty of the conclusions which may be drawn from archaeological evidence. The rather nonchalant way in which he disposes of Sergi's belief in the existence of a "Mediterranean race" might well suggest a greater caution in advancing similar "pure hypotheses", based on the evidence turned up by the spade. Finally, his deliberate restriction of his book to military and political history of the external development of Rome—in the latter two-thirds of the volume—results not infrequently in a distortion of the picture. The political quarrels with the plebs hampered the sphere of military action of the Senate. The relations with Hellas were at least partly affected by the idea of spiritual dependence.

HERBERT WING, JR.

*Histoire Anonyme de la Première Croisade.* Édité et traduite par Louis Bréhier, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Clermont-Ferrand. [Les Classiques de l'Histoire de France au Moyen Âge.] (Paris, Champion, 1924, pp. xxxvi, 258, 15 fr.)

*Anonymi Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolymitanorum.* Edited by Beatrice A. Lees, M.A. (Oxford, Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press, 1924, pp. xxxii, 156, 7 s. 6 d.)

The first of these books is the best edition of the *Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*. The critical apparatus is excellent. The especial contributions are the restoration of a more primitive text than any in a previous edition; the division of the work into the ten recitals, which M. Bréhier argues, probably correctly, were the original form of the chronicles; and the indication of the digressions and interpolations, due to the hand of a clerk who assisted the anonymous author or else added later. The result is to enhance the value of the parts which can undoubtedly be attributed to the knight who was the chief author. More than ever the *Gesta* stands out as the best source for the First Crusade. There is an excellent index.

The second volume is intended primarily for students at Oxford preparing for the preliminary examination in modern history. It is done very well indeed, although it is not as original or useful to scholars as Bréhier's edition. It contains a brief but sufficient introduction, including a sketch of the First Crusade. The text followed is that printed by Bongars with emendations. The notes, which fill forty-seven pages, are well selected and occasionally add something even to the voluminous apparatus of Hagenmeyer's edition. There is an excellent select bibliography, an index, and a map of Syria in the twelfth century.

D. C. M.

*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society.* Fourth series, volume VII. (London, the Society, 1924, pp. 215.) Of the six papers in this volume, five are by ladies, but a sufficiently masculine ingredient is added in the sixth, which is a somewhat acrimonious reply by Mr. Douglas Dewar and Professor H. A. Garrett to Mr. F. W. Buckler's paper in the last volume on the Political Theory of the Indian Mutiny. In the other papers, Miss E. C. Lodge treats of Edward I. and his tenants in chief in Gascony, exhibiting their relations as casting light on his whole policy as king of England; Madame Inna Lubimenko writes from Russian sources on the Struggle of the Dutch with the English for the Russian Market in the Seventeenth Century, showing how and why the Dutch ultimately prevailed; Miss A. E. Levett describes the Courts and Court Rolls of St. Albans Abbey, bringing together much material not hitherto used; Miss Grace Stretton uses the wardrobe accounts of Henry, earl of Derby, afterward Henry IV., for the years 1390-1393, when he "reyesd in Pruce" and in Palestine, to illustrate the means and processes of medieval travel; and Miss Rose Graham gives a thorough treatment of the English Province of the Order of Cluny in the Fifteenth Century, tracing the whole process of separation of the English Cluniac monasteries from the mother-houses in France.

*The Pipe Roll for 1295, Surrey Membrane (Pipe Roll, 140).* [Surrey Record Society, no. XXI.] (London, for the Society, 1924, pp. 4, lxxii, 63.) This volume, edited by Miss Mabel H. Mills, contains the text of the Surrey membrane in the Pipe Roll of 23 Edward I. with a translation, introduction, and notes. To the editor was delegated the task of elucidating the items in the audit of the accounts of the sheriff and of the other debtors whose names appear on the roll under Surrey. Only those who have used the late thirteenth-century Pipe Rolls can realize the difficulties involved in such a project and the enormous amount of work entailed. Miss Mills has made a thorough search of all available documents for information and the result is the first adequate description of what the Pipe Roll entries meant more than a century after the *Dialogus*.

After a brief statement of the records used and the "normal organization of a county for financial purposes" there is given in detail the story

of the dealings with the Exchequer of Robert de Glamorgan, the sheriff, and other debtors. Robert's accounting is traced through two proffers and the audit to the "final view". The arrears of Geoffrey de Cruce, a complicated affair, are disentangled and the items relating to bailiffs and farmers carefully worked out. A debt charged against the prior of Newmark is shown to have been originally owed by a farmer of Southampton in 18 Henry II. It was not removed from the rolls until 13 Edward III. The notes add further details.

While the merits of this pioneer study are great, the style is far from easy and the plan of separating detailed from general matter in the introduction unfortunate. The editor seems to have been handicapped by lack of sufficient space, and so has left in obscurity the "final view" and certain other matters such as the character of the entries on the Receipt Roll used in dating the appearance of debtors at the Exchequer. These are minor faults in a book based on sound scholarship and wide knowledge of the field.

JAMES F. WILLARD.

*Snappe's Formulary and other Records.* Edited by the Reverend H. E. Salter, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. [Oxford Historical Society, vol. LXXX.] (Oxford, printed for the Society at the Clarendon Press, 1924, pp. xii, 404.) This meaty volume is of the general type described earlier in the same series as *Oxford Collectanea*. Only a score of pages are occupied by the Formulary of Snappe, consisting of various forms of interest chiefly for canonical procedure; the remainder analyzes or prints for the first time a great number and variety of documents valuable for the medieval history of the university, respecting both its internal economy and its relations to the king, the bishop of Lincoln, and the archbishop of Canterbury. A considerable part relates to the fifteenth century, especially to the turbulent years of the Lollard difficulties. One of the most curious of these texts is the roll of an inquisition held at Oriel College in 1411, a vivid bit of university life for which only extracts have hitherto been available. There is a critical list of the chancellors and proctors to 1434. The concluding section contains materials concerning Gloucester College, which has a special interest as "the normal place of residence of the Benedictine monks sent to study at Oxford". Save for this final section, due to Mr. V. H. Galbraith, the volume is the work of Rev. H. E. Salter, to whose accurate and tireless scholarship the society's *Publications* are deeply indebted.

C. H. H.

*Inter Alia, a Scottish Calendar of Crime, and other Historical Essays.* By the Right Hon. Sir Herbert Maxwell, Bt., F.R.S., LL.D., D.C.L. (Glasgow, Maclehose, Jackson, and Company, 1924, pp. x, 323, 15 s.) It happens all too rarely that an expert in one field of knowledge publishes anything of value outside his own particular subject. For many

years, however, Sir Herbert Maxwell has contributed to historical literature in reviews and public lectures, and we welcome this delightful volume even though only one essay of the twelve—that entitled “A French Empire in England 1810–11”—is “now offered for the first time”. Sir Herbert writes with charm and distinction and with much of the professional historian’s ability, sanity, and judgment. He has an eye for the essential, a sound conception of scientific method, and a sober sense of the validity of conclusions.

The essays range from a survey of Scottish crime dating back to the early sixteenth century to the period of Napoleon. The present reviewer’s sense of professional duty was accentuated when he found that his direct ancestors the Earls of Cassillis were just as bad as their neighbors. Nor was this interest lessened when he had read Sir Herbert’s fascinating essay on John Knox, since his boyhood had been torn between the extreme views of that worthy which Sir Herbert so admirably balances. The essay on the Casket Letters is full of wisdom and is perhaps the best summary extant of a problem never likely to be solved. Other essays of interest are those on Agincourt and on Sir John Moore.

The format of the volume is excellent and there are some good illustrations. The specialist need not look here for much of permanent value, but for the general reader of history this is one of the most fascinating books of recent times.

W. P. M. K.

*Les Origines de Fribourg et le Quartier du Bourg aux XV<sup>e</sup> et XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècles.* Par Pierre de Zurich. [Mémoires et Documents publiés par la Société d’Histoire de la Suisse Romande, seconde série, tome XII.] (Lausanne and Geneva, Payot, 1924, pp. iv, 319, plan, 10 fr.) The author of this work has already made substantial contributions to the history of this section of Switzerland and now presents a complete study of the ancient part of Fribourg, which is a valuable addition to medieval history at large. He begins by a re-examination of the foundation of the town, which owes its corporate existence to Berchtold IV. of Zähringen. The date ordinarily given is 1178, but a review of the charters and the citation of monastic documents not hitherto called in seem to show that the start was made in 1157. Doubtless the world will not be appreciably affected by this advance of a few years in the time of the foundation, but it is the historian’s business to be correct if possible, and the procedure in this case is so exact and the argument so carefully set forth that chapter I. might well be used in a seminary as an example for practice in historical method.

It is the story of the establishment of a defensible market town upon a route of travel already long in use. A ford in the river Saane had attracted a few settlers at the base of a steep bluff. Seeing the importance of the spot from a fiscal as well as a military point of view, the Zähringen fortified the top of this cliff, and for several centuries the original boundary formed the limits of the town, while even to-day the same precinct is known as the Bourg.

The documents upon which one may base a description of the Bourg emanate from a later period, hence the elaborate topographical history which forms the second part of this book is devoted to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It is in fact a house-to-house search for evidences of forms and names and usages. Nor is this a matter of mere archaeological curiosity, for Fribourg was bounded by the same walls without enlargement until the fourteenth century, and the older part still looks like a city of that date.

The writer of this review has upon the walls of his study a copperplate engraving, some six feet by three in size, dated 1606, and giving a bird's-eye view of Fribourg which would serve for a guide to the Bourg to-day, as it has served the author as one guide to the earlier centuries. While doubtless this part of the work will be more interesting to natives of Fribourg than to others, the book is a scientific contribution to medieval history.

J. M. VINCENT.

*The Records of King Edward's School, Birmingham.* Volume I. *The "Miscellany" Volume.* With an Introduction by William Fowler Carter, B.A., F.S.A. [Publications of the Dugdale Society, vol. IV.] (London and New York, Oxford University Press for the Society, 1924, pp. lxxii, 95.) This volume contains source-material of interest to the student of American as well as of English history. Our institutional history is directly related to the English institutional history of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and this is especially true of educational origins. For the colonists consciously and unconsciously imitated and adapted, for their immediate needs, English educational institutions and ideals, forms of administration, support, content of the curriculum, and other practices.

These records of the Free Grammar School of King Edward the Sixth in Birmingham are illustrative particularly of the practice of endowing schools with lands for the purpose of providing free education. This method was used by the colonists and later by the national government on a large scale in the public-land states of the West. The introduction has an illuminating discussion of the phrases "grammar school" and "free school" (*libera schola*), and other sections contain documentary material made up of tax rolls, rental rolls, and an account of all the school leases of land for the year 1564-1565. There is also a translation of the letters patent of Edward Sixth for the school. The editing appears to have been carefully done and there is an index of the surnames mentioned in the volume.

M. W. JERNEGAN.

*A Defence of Liberty against Tyrants.* A Translation of the *Vindiciae contra Tyrannos* by Junius Brutus, with an Historical Introduction by Harold J. Laski, Reader in Political Science in the University of Lon-

don. (London, G. Bell and Sons; New York, Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1924, pp. vii, 229, 8s. 6d.) The *Vindiciae contra Tyrannos* exercised so great an influence in so many tongues that the frequently reprinted English translation deserved to be put before modern readers with helpful apparatus. Dr. Laski's introduction is stimulating, although naturally some of his generalizations should be treated with caution and compared with the *Vindiciae* and other Huguenot writings. For example, his statement, "Duplessis-Mornay shares to the full the characteristic Huguenot contempt for the people" (p. 48), should be contrasted with the striking assertions of the powers and rights of the people in the third and fourth questions in this very book and with like passages in Beza and Hotman. Unfortunately, here as elsewhere, some of the helpful marginal notes in the original were omitted in the English translation; and still more unfortunately the notes retained in 1689 have been omitted in this "reprint of the translation of 1689". The entire omission of all references to the authorities cited both in the original and the translation is a distinct loss in many ways.

A satisfactory reprint should either follow the translation or indicate what the changes are. Where the translation was incorrect or obscure, the modern reprint should give the original or a correct translation. Dr. Laski gives the reader no clue on any of these points, not even a suggestion as to the unreliability of the translation. The reader who desires to test this may turn to the first three pages, where he will find half a dozen omissions, mistranslations, or insertions of matter not in the Latin or French, but repeated here from the translation of 1689. So large a proportion has not been noted in later pages; but the later errors are more serious, and they are sufficiently frequent and serious to demand correction in order to make the translation reliable and intelligible. Examples of such unreliability or unintelligibility, which might have been corrected either through annotations or through following the original in the rearrangement of sentence and paragraph structure, may be found on pages 66-67, 70, 134 (omission of a significant sentence on taxation), and 152, where will be found standing as a complete paragraph this nonsense—"Briefly, who (as the wise man says) carried death at his tongue's end, we must not think so idly."

This edition does not have the excuse of being a verbatim reprint, for not only have the useful references and notes been omitted, but the paragraphing, sentence structure, capitalization, spelling, and punctuation have been freely changed, with no hint to the reader. On the other hand it does reprint faithfully the errors of the translation of 1689, and fails to give the needed correction and clarification which would have avoided the misunderstandings sure to be perpetuated in this unannotated edition. Such faults should be avoided in subsequent reprints in the series suggested in the prefatory note.

H. D. FOSTER.



*Hessel Gerritz; Beschrijvinghe van der Samoyeden Landt en Histoire du Pays nommé Spitsberghe.* Uitgegeven door S. P. L'Honoré Naber. [Werken uitgegeven door de Linschoten-Vereeniging, XXIII.] (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1924, pp. liv, 125, plates, 10 gulden.) In this edition are reprinted two important and practically inaccessible books from the press of the Amsterdam printer Hessel Gerritz. The first, subsequently designated as the *Detectio Freti* or *Hudson Tract*, describes the lands of Siberia westwards of the Yenisei. It was written largely with the aid of Isaac Massa, a Haarlem burgher who had just spent a decade or so in Russia in the interests of trade and who collected data for an important history of the troublous times in the Muscovite empire which appeared ultimately in the second volume of the *Rerum Rossicarum Scriptores Exteri* (St. Petersburg, 1868). The account is valuable as indicating the active interest in the commercial possibilities of these regions and the speculation concerning a feasible route to China through the Arctic. Accordingly the pamphlet is part of the tradition of van Linschoten, Barents, van Heemskerk, Rijp, and Hudson. Then follow the memorial of De Quiros touching his explorations of Australia and a brief statement about Hudson's ill-starred voyage. The text here reproduced is that of the Dutch edition of 1612, but the variants and more extended accounts which appeared in the Latin versions of 1612 and 1613 are also reprinted. The second pamphlet, the *Histoire du Pays nommé Spitsberghe*, appeared in 1613 and traces the Dutch connection with that island after its discovery by Barents in 1596 and discusses the conduct of the English towards their Dutch and French rivals in these parts. As in the first treatise traces of Plancius's co-operation are easily felt. The value of the work is increased by the reproduction of the four maps which appeared in the edition of 1613. Dr. Naber has maintained the same excellence which characterized his previous editions in the same series.

HENRY S. LUCAS.

*Spanische Kultur des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts.* Von Ludwig Pfandl. (Kempten, Verlag Josef Kösel und Friedrich Pustet, 1924, pp. xv, 288.) Ludwig Pfandl's study of Spanish culture and customs during the gorgeous Spanish Golden Age is one of the most useful books of the sort ever written. Scholars will not all agree with the learned author that Philip the Second was "the most scrupulous, the justest, and most conscientious of all Spanish kings" (although the task of sifting contradictory evidence is here well-nigh hopeless and it will no doubt always remain impossible to judge him with any degree of confidence); and many of Ludwig Pfandl's readers may decline to accept his evaluation of the Spanish Inquisition as "entirely apart from its idealistic motives a measure of national defense and as such entirely justified . . . saving the country all the misery of those religious wars which lacerated the rest of Europe so pitifully for a century". But general conclusions of this sort do not affect the honesty and the documentary value of the book, except indeed

as they have made it a labor of love and a living record which throbs with interest, rather than, as is the case with many such attempts, a diluted doctoral dissertation.

The beautifully printed and lavishly illustrated study opens with a somewhat nervous chapter on Philip the Second, the only part of the book in which the author's personal feeling has proved a handicap, continues with a succinct résumé of the reigns of the weak last three Hapsburgs, and then passes into a vivid but always carefully documented study of Spanish institutions and Spanish ways—government, the constitution of society, religion, education, literature, and, most delightful of all, a long and zestful chapter on the daily life of the men and women who moved the pen of Cervantes, Lope de Vega, Calderon, and the brush of Murillo, Velasquez, and the subtle Greek Theotocopuli. This chapter, and notably the clear and colorful pictures of old Toledo, Madrid, and Seville—Toledo, the proud daughter of the Church, clinging stubbornly and sadly to her ancient greatness; Madrid, the hustling new capital; Seville, the casement-window ajar on Africa, the blue ocean, and the rich and glamorous New World—is severe scholarship and poetry in a perfect blend. With the great and increasing interest in this country in Spain and her one-time colonies, it will certainly not be long till this excellent work is available in English translation.

ROY TEMPLE HOUSE.

*Genève Pépinière du Calvinisme Hollandais. I. Les Étudiants des Pays-Bas à Genève au Temps de Théodore de Bèze. II. Correspondance des Élèves de Théodore de Bèze après leur Départ de Genève.* Par H. de Vries de Heckelingen, Professeur à l'Université de Nimègue. (I. Frisbourg, Fragnière, 1918; II. the Hague, Nijhoff, 1924, pp. xv, 331; xxxii, 446, 27 florins.) The list of 310 students from the Netherlands during Beza's rectorship of the University of Geneva, 1559-1605, adds nearly one hundred to those previously known. This annotated list and the 224 documents, chiefly letters, edited with great industry and painstaking scholarship, make a contribution to both Genevan and Dutch history. Among the students who carried back the influence of Geneva, were Marnix St. Aldegonde, Roorda, signer of the Dutch Declaration of Independence incorporating the political theories of Beza and his fellow-professor, Hotman; twenty of the Contraremonstrants, the reactionary orthodox Calvinists; but also fourteen chiefs of the liberal, unorthodox Remonstrants, including Arminius, Wtenbogaert, Vorstius, students and personal friends of Beza, and his remarkably liberal colleague Perrot.

Unfortunately the introductory matter of volume I. can not command the same confidence as the documents. Following apparently the partisanship of Fazy, Galiffe, and Brunetière, rather than the Genevan documents and the writings of Calvin, Beza, and Goulart, the editor, in his endeavors to establish his thesis of the aristocratic tendencies of Calvinists, fails to see the other side of the shield, and misses the real contribu-

tion of the men he studies. His perhaps unconscious bias is also suggested in his descriptions of Calvinists as "*apostats*", who abandoned "the bosom of the Church", until, in the French Revolution, "we see those who reject the Representative of God on earth subject themselves to men who will have neither God nor master".

HERBERT DARLING FOSTER.

*The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Publick Benefits.* By Bernard Mandeville. With a Commentary, Critical, Historical, and Explanatory, by F. B. Kaye. In two volumes. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1924, pp. cxlvi, 412; 481.) Recently an acute critic has reminded us that satire—except for the "deathless" productions of Aristophanes, Juvenal, Swift, and Voltaire—"is the frailest of all literary forms". Few, for example, would now enjoy the "airily malicious" thrusts in Tom Moore's *Two-penny Post Bag*, while even Peacock's *Nightmare Abbey* remains a delectation for a rather select minority. Dealing with the general subjects of human nature and ethical and economic problems, rather than with specific individuals and current events, Bernard Mandeville's daringly cynical *Fable of the Bees*, even after the subsidence of the first furious uproar which it excited, kept a fairly enduring hold on the public attention. Nevertheless the last English edition, previous to the one now before us, appeared in 1806, the last French translation was printed in 1760, and while a patient German tiller in the field of scholarship produced one so late as 1914, it was—strange to relate—not complete; moreover it had had no predecessor in the Teutonic tongue since 1817.

Dr. F. B. Kaye, of Northwestern University, has now produced a new edition "with a commentary, critical, historical, and explanatory"—an elaboration of a dissertation presented for the degree of doctor of philosophy at Yale University in 1917—so thorough as to make a reasonable claim to be definitive. In a scholarly introduction of some hundred and thirty pages he deals successively with: the life of Mandeville, the history of the text, Mandeville's thought, the background, and Mandeville's influence. He has ranged over wide areas of literature for possible sources of the derivation of Mandeville's ideas; also with the further aim of tracing his influence on subsequent generations of thinkers and writers. While the editor is keen on enhancing the importance of his author, his enthusiasm is, on the whole, tempered with caution as well as honesty. In surveying the meagre facts concerning Mandeville's life he works with apparent success to demolish the web of gossip woven with ill-nature and mendacity by Sir John Hawkins. Then follow the text—carefully and amply annotated—a description of editions, chiefly of interest to the bibliographer; extracts and digests, with critical comments, of criticisms of the *Fable* by William Law, Richard Fiddes, John Dennis, George Blouet, Bishop Berkeley, Lord Hervey, Adam Smith, and John Brown; and, finally, a selected list, chronologically arranged, of references in literature to Mandeville's work, from its publication to the present. More might

have been made of the fact that the defense of luxury as a stimulus to prosperity would hardly be accepted by the majority of economists and publicists to-day, and the editor's apologia seems in places over-subtle; otherwise Dr. Kaye's work is generally to be commended. Furthermore the Clarendon Press is to be congratulated upon such a handsome specimen of book-making.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

*Histoire Politique des Protestants Français, 1715-1794.* Par l'Abbé Joseph Dedieu, Docteur ès Lettres. In two volumes. (Paris, J. Gabalda, 1925, pp. xv, 422, 375, 25 fr.) This study forms one of the series of historical works initiated by Leo XIII. in 1897, the purpose of which was to produce a universal ecclesiastical history by the method of collaboration and in accordance with the standards of modern historical research. The *Histoire Politique des Protestants Français, 1715-1794*, was entrusted to the Abbé Joseph Dedieu, already known for his writings on Montesquieu. It does not deal with the internal history of the Protestant church in France, but is limited to the relations of Protestantism with the monarchy. Starting with the death of Louis XIV. the author portrays a situation tense with the opposition between extreme rigor on the one hand and disregard of the law if not actual disloyalty and treason on the other. In all the course of this conflict through the eighteenth century, the difficulties were only accentuated by the insistence on the part of the monarchy that the question was one of politics while the Protestants maintained that it was a matter not of politics but of religion. It is this highly controversial material that the Abbé Dedieu sets out to study and for the most part he does it with much objectivity and an attempt to consider the varied points of view of the parties directly concerned. He finds, for example, in this case of the central government, instead of a regular and consistent policy in pursuing the tradition of Louis XIV., irregularity, arbitrariness, and vacillation, and among the intendants and royal agents diversity of action and lack of harmony with each other and with the central government. The result was that in some places the Protestants were tolerated and in others prosecuted and that in some regions they would at one time be treated with laxity and at another with extreme cruelty. He finds on the other hand that they often brought upon themselves this severity by taking advantage of the weakness of the government and by their extreme demands and injudicious conduct, which he declares went to the length of disloyalty and alliance with the enemies of France. In support of this latter assertion he points out the coincidence of Protestant uprisings with the embarrassments of France in foreign war.

The phase of the situation in which these contradictions and discrepancies made the most constant difficulty was in the lack of laws providing for the legal marriage of Protestants, out of which grew interminable conflicts as to inheritance of property and heartrending personal tragedies. Altogether this study forms a vivid picture of that "chaos of competing

authorities" and overlapping jurisdictions which was so marked a feature of the *ancien régime*.

ELOISE ELLERY.

*Every-day Life on an old Highland Farm, 1769-1782.* By I. F. Grant. With a Preface by W. R. Scott, M.A., Phil.D., Adam Smith Professor of Political Economy in the University of Glasgow. (London and New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1924, pp. xi, 277, plates, 12 s. 6 d.) In its original form the account book of Capt. William Mackintosh of Balnespick could have interest or significance for only a comparatively small group of students of agrarian history. Under Miss Grant's painstaking and intelligent editing the value of this document to the specialist is greatly increased. In addition, she has made "the scribbled, private jottings of a fussy, hard-headed, conscientious old gentleman" the basis for an essay on farming and farm life in central Scotland 150 years ago which is at once authoritative and full of general human interest.

The account book itself (appendix I., pp. 153-276) is liberally supplied with foot-notes explaining obsolete terms and furnishing biographical data concerning the persons, chiefly subtenants and relatives, with whom Balnespick had business dealings. The body of the book, consisting of eight chapters (pp. 1-152), describes the situation of the farm at Dunachton and the general appearance and conditions of the country-side, and gives the social and economic background for the account book.

Drawing liberally from the accounts of contemporary observers, Miss Grant has skillfully made use of Balnespick's disorganized records to confirm or to modify their generalizations. The picture she gives is of subsistence farming, laborious and unproductive, not unlike the self-sufficient agriculture of inland communities in New England at the end of the eighteenth century. Both were characterized by lack of thorough cultivation, use of crude, home-made implements, low yields, lack of root crops, half-starved and neglected cattle. The bare existence of the country people was enlivened by the same rough pleasures, and exhibited similar traits of frugality and mutual helpfulness.

The important difference between rural conditions in the Highlands and in New England is to be found in the proportions of labor to land. The Highlands were suffering from overpopulation, a condition which made possible the continuance of semi-feudal land tenure and led to minute subdivision of holdings. But in New England the scarcity of population relative to land resulted in freehold tenure in comparatively large parcels. In the discussion of the conditions of land tenure at Dunachton, and in the analysis of the intricate relations of the "tacksman" to the landlord on the one hand and to his subtenants on the other, the author has made what is probably her most important contribution.

The lack of maps and the occasional failure to explain obsolete or provincial terms are somewhat of a handicap to the general reader.

P. W. BIDWELL.

*The Turco-Egyptian Question in the Relations of England, France, and Russia, 1832-1841.* By Frederick Stanley Rodkey. [University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, vol. XI., nos. 3 and 4.] (Urbana, the University, 1924, pp. 274, \$2.00.) Quite apart from its intrinsic value, this monograph is interesting as an illustration of the results which may be achieved by an American student who ventures to write on a complicated phase of the diplomatic history of nineteenth-century Europe from materials available in his own country, i.e., from printed materials and the archives of the American Department of State. Whether the product of such an undertaking can possess a value commensurate with the amount of work involved is open to question; but, even in this field, where some of the most important printed sources are notoriously treacherous, there is much to be said for any preliminary study which brings together masses of material not previously collated and which offers fresh emphasis. Such are the services which this author performs. From an imposing and carefully selected assemblage of published documents, memoirs, contemporary periodicals, and secondary works (for the value of the American archives is well-nigh negligible), he has produced a well-proportioned, firmly knit, and fully documented narrative, which, if necessarily familiar in content, may be used with profit even by special students of the period. And he has brought some aspects—notably the efforts of the British government, during the 'thirties, to develop the Red Sea and Euphrates routes to India—into unfamiliar and desirable relief. Yet some caution must be suggested to those who propose to use the book. The title, though not misleading, may mislead. For the writer not only treats the effects of the developments of the Turco-Egyptian question with scant reference to other factors and events which exercised on those relations a co-ordinately determining influence, but makes little effort to estimate the more general effects of the developments themselves. One might, for example, close the book without realization of the extent to which the British government's refusal to allow to France any concession which would have saved her face exacerbated the feelings of French statesmen against Palmerston and any administration in which he was to play a part; in other words, without preparation for the bitter misunderstandings between the two governments which were to prove so serious for much of Europe, and for so many African slaves, within the following decade. Or, if such rigidity of treatment be held permissible, one must at least find fault with certain matters of detail. There is a looseness of statement which may in some cases be connected with gaps in the generally excellent bibliography. Thus the omission of any mention of Talleyrand's well-worn memoirs may account for the statement that "the Court of St. James refused to entertain" the suggestion of armed mediation in January, 1833 (p. 20). Nor can one pass over the occasional careless use of English (see, e.g., p. 115, lines 18-22) and the not infrequent carelessness in translation (e.g., p. 138, line 20; p. 142, line 26). It is a pity that work so painstaking and effective should be thus marred.

HERBERT C. BELL.

*Tory Democracy.* By William J. Wilkinson, Ph.D., Professor of History at Colby College. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. CXV., no. 2.] (New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1925, pp. 315, \$3.50.) This volume contains a useful study of the "Progressive" movement in British domestic politics. It attempts by a careful examination of periodical literature, the daily press, parliamentary debates, collections of speeches, and recent biographies to mass together everything available in support of the thesis that Tory Democracy is a reality and a continuing force in Conservative ranks from the days of Disraeli to those of Lord Cecil. Chapter V., the Fruitage of Tory Democracy, is practically a review and a glorification of the social legislation passed in the days of Tory governments or advocated by individual Tories. As regards Ireland the social reforms inaugurated under Unionist leadership receive tribute. The attempt is made to praise the Education Acts which Sir John Gorst, as education minister, fostered, in the early part of the present century. Finally, the rootage of many of the measures of social reform passed by the Liberals after 1906 is claimed for the Tories. In more recent years it is shown that vital present questions, such as the housing question, have received attention at the hands of Tory Democrats. Thus the descent is traced, from the days of the first factory act in 1833 to the Tory support of woman's suffrage, of that tradition which has maintained that "all government exists solely for the good of the governed; that Church and King, Lords and Commons and all other public institutions are to be maintained so far, and so far only, as they promote the happiness and welfare of the common people".

Such a defense of Toryism was much needed, especially in the United States, which has been affected in its judgment of British affairs too much by the weight of the party term "Liberal" as well as by our natural approval of the party that supported Home Rule for Ireland. Yet it is a question whether it is possible to pass fair judgment on the left wing of the Tory party without fuller reference to colonial and foreign policies. Even the tariff question is given scant attention. Such problems are at least domestic to the British Empire, if not to Great Britain. References to the early sympathies of Lord Randolph Churchill with Egyptian nationalism and mention of his private flirtations with some aspects of Home Rule do not sufficiently expose the fact that in imperial questions Tory Democrats fail to carry the progressive colors which they most certainly do as regards social reforms at home. As a whole, however, the volume is, within its limitations, an excellent review of the subject.

A. L. P. DENNIS.

*Die Geschichtswissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen.* Herausgegeben von Dr. Sigfrid Steinberg. (Leipzig, Verlag von Felix Meiner, 1925, pp. viii, 274, 10 RM.) Dr. Steinberg has collected in this volume seven autobiographies of leading contemporary German historians, proceeding on the plausible supposition that the personal career of an his-



torian has a very material influence upon his historical judgments and opinions. The book thus is to serve the obviously useful purpose of acquainting the reader with the facts and circumstances which have helped to form the individual historian's outlook. The essays, to be sure, are not mere professional memoirs; they contain, in addition to an analysis of researches and publications, the historical *credo*, as it were, of the historian. Had Dr. Steinberg chosen men of more Olympian stature or had the historians themselves adequately met the challenge of a pitilessly searching self-analysis of their work as historians, it would be difficult to imagine a more authentic contribution which one generation of historians can give to another. Both of these conditions have been met only very imperfectly. Of the seven autobiographies at best only two, those of Georg von Below and Walter Götz, reveal real strength and sanity of thought which make them stimulating reading. The others are either too exclusively reminiscent, which only in the case of the octogenarian Max Lehmann may seem pardonable, or their contributions are devoid of any positive value to the world of professional historians. The book is generally more representative of the various branches of historical study than of historians, as a glance at the names will show (G. von Below, Alfons Dopsch, Walter Götz, Georg Steinhausen, H. Finke, R. F. Kaindl). Yet such as it is the volume is replete with interest. Students of legal history will find it piquant to learn that von Below divides his intellectual history into the periods before and after he came into contact with Treitschke and his system of politics. He does not say it himself, but it ought to occasion no surprise that, after Treitschke had given to the state such a terrible momentum, von Below should spend a lifetime in an effort to prove that mediaeval Germany was a state and not simply a group of feudal societies. The book furthermore contains a subterranean controversy between Götz and Steinhausen as to what constitutes the legitimate province of the historian of culture. Götz places the major emphasis on the history of thought, while Steinhausen unfolds a theory of "Kulturgeschichte" (pp. 243-253) which savors strongly of the antiquarianism of the museum and the archaeology of bric-à-brac.

WALTER L. DORN.

*The Merchant Navy.* By Archibald Hurd. Volume II. [History of the Great War based on Official Documents, by direction of the Historical Section of the Committee of Imperial Defence.] (London, John Murray; New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1924, pp. xvii, 464, 21 s.) The first volume of this invaluable work, published in 1921 (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXVII. 122), brought the record of the part taken by the merchant navy in the World War down to the early months of the year 1915, when the *Lusitania* was torpedoed with a loss of 1200 lives. The present volume, while covering the cruises of the remaining German raiders, and the successful transportation of troops, is in the main a record of German "frightfulness" by sea, continuing the narrative to the eve of

the German declaration of "unrestricted submarine warfare", on February 1, 1917, a period of some twenty months which the author calls the "intermediate stage" of the war at sea, from President Wilson's first serious protests against the attacks upon the sovereign rights of the United States to the final moral plunge of the German government.

It is recalled that, while Germany heeded the American protests at first, the chief of the German Great General Staff, von Falkenhayn, early in 1916 succeeded in bringing about a return to the former brutal methods of submarine warfare, and that the torpedoing of the *Sussex* caused what was virtually an ultimatum to be issued by the Washington government. The manner in which the resulting decision of the Imperial Chancellor to yield to the American demands was received by the officers of both military services, as well as the German people itself (*vide* the German industrialists' petition to their government to annex the Belgian ports), clearly showed that the German people, against which our own government ever insisted that the American nation was not hostile, nevertheless not only did not back its government when the latter adopted more humane methods, but bitterly opposed what was universally declared to be weakness; so that, in the end, the Chancellor was obliged to yield to the fierce opposition and to reopen unrestricted warfare by the submarines.

What broke the back of German resistance in the long run was, in addition to the realization that American troops were actually on the firing-line, the blockade, which, as Mr. Hurd justly points out, was, though supported by the navy, actually enforced by merchant ships, mostly, to be sure, commanded by naval officers with a nucleus of active service ratings and men from the Royal Fleet Reserve under them. It must be admitted that the author is justified when he remarks that "the spirit in which these operations were prosecuted in fair weather and foul, and in high latitudes where cold and fog prevail, constitutes the supreme vindication of the character and seamanlike qualities of the Merchant Navy, which was to be reinforced before the war came to its close by thousands of incidents of splendid and daring heroism in face of hopeless odds, and noble self-sacrifice in the common cause". Mr. Hurd mentions, as one who has come to be accepted throughout the world as the typical figure of the British merchant seaman, Captain Charles Fryatt, whose judicial murder crystallized the opinion of the neutral world against Germany.

This volume, like its predecessor, is less a history than a detailed chronicle which will always be invaluable to the future historian. The appendixes contain the instructions given to merchant captains, and records and analyses of submarine sinkings. There are four maps.

EDWARD BRECK.

*The Empire at War.* Edited by Sir Charles Lucas, K.C.B., K.C.M.G. [For the Royal Colonial Institute.] Volume III. (London and New York, Oxford University Press, 1924, pp. x, 430, maps, 21 s.) The publication of this work, proceeding according to the original plan, has now

reached the third volume, which is devoted to the Australasian dominions and the British islands in the Pacific. The non-combatant history of Australia and New Zealand during the war is told in outline by the general editor, Sir Charles Lucas, while the story of their fighting forces is related in much greater detail. Mr. C. E. W. Bean and a group of anonymous associates tell of the activities of the Australian expeditionary forces, and Mr. Malcolm Ross does the same for those of New Zealand. It is evident that the writers have taken pains to secure full and accurate information, but the value of their work, for reference purposes, would be greater if the plan of the series permitted them to give their authorities. As in the preceding volume, there are useful maps to illustrate the military campaigns and a number of photographic illustrations. The volume is indispensable for anyone who wishes to study the war history and activities of the most British of all the British dominions.

*The Permanent Court of International Justice and the Question of American Participation*, with a Collection of Documents, by Manley O. Hudson, Bemis Professor of International Law in the Harvard Law School. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1925, pp. ix, 389, \$4.00.) No doubt the primary appeal which this volume makes is that of timeliness, for nowhere else is there so well organized or so thorough a discussion of the problems which are involved in the proposed entrance of the United States into the World Court. As is to be expected, the work is to a certain extent polemic, particularly in the consideration of the function of the court in giving advisory opinions, but even where controversial the author is reasonable, and his intimate acquaintance with all of the activities of the court, as well as of the League of Nations, enables him to write with authority. The book is in no sense the *aperçu* of an amateur.

Aside from its timeliness, Professor Hudson has made a contribution from the point of view of historical writing, for the first half of the work is a record of the court as an active factor in the world-process. What the court has done year by year, the first, second, and third of its existence, may be followed here, not necessarily as a line of argument in order to justify its existence, but as a chronicle of achievement. The drafting of the statute, the organization of the court, the adoption of rules of procedure, are described, but the emphasis is placed upon what the court has actually done. The second part considers the question of American participation, and this involves a critical examination of the administration plans of adherence. Appendixes include the documentary material reasonably up to date. The proposed relations of the court to the Geneva protocol of 1924 are not considered. There is a convenient bibliography. The fault of the book is inherent where there is involved the reprinting of articles which have already appeared in various publications. There is considerable repetition, not so much in the way of detail, but in certain lines of thought. There is not so much repetition, however, as to inter-

fere with the readability of the book. It is a convenient work, timely, and valuable to the student as well as to the general reader.

*List of Manuscripts concerning American History preserved in European Libraries and noted in their Published Catalogues and similar Printed Lists.* By David M. Matteson. (Washington, D. C., Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1925, pp. viii, 203, paper, \$2.50; cloth, \$3.50.) This latest of the *Guides* published by the Carnegie Institution is the fruit of an examination of printed descriptions of 193 libraries, located in 174 cities, and gleans about 2000 manuscripts in 14 languages. A partial collation indicates that American scholars may rely upon the comprehensiveness of the results obtained, within the purpose aimed at. This is to include everything relating to the United States and its American dependencies, to the British possessions in North America, and to northern Mexico.

The values of the materials revealed can be realized only after its use by particular investigators. A certain proportion is locally cherished merely for autographs; others have been published. Perhaps the most important and most widely distributed class is that of the maps. Genealogical material also is widely scattered. Aside from these, it is interesting to observe that the great bulk of the manuscripts conform to one's natural expectations of each locality. French sea-coast towns have material on fishing; all French towns on the war of the Revolution; Liverpool on the slave trade; some German towns on German troops in the Revolution; Cracow on Polish emigration; Denmark on Greenland, the sagas, and the Danish West Indies. Amsterdam has a rather extensive collection of correspondence on finance and scholarship; Berlin a smaller collection plus Humboldt material on America; Munich material on the earlier period and the Salzburg emigration; Madrid on exploration; the collection of the British Museum alone gives evidence of active growth. Special pieces noted are a diary of the siege of Quebec 1775-1776, at Glasgow; a history of Bavarian and Anspach regiments in the Revolution, at Bayreuth; papers on the Swedes in Pennsylvania, at Lund; accounts of early eighteenth-century settlements, at Bern.

CARL RUSSELL FISH.

*Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society.* Number 29. (New York, the Society, 1925, pp. xliii, 264.) In this composite volume, one of the most interesting items is a body of notes on the Spanish and Portuguese Jews in the United States, Guiana, and the Dutch and British West Indies during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, by Senhor Cardozo de Bethencourt, formerly librarian of the Lisbon Academy of Sciences, whose notes, which add considerably to our knowledge of many persons, are derived partly from sources in Spain and Portugal, but largely from the archives of the Portuguese Jewish community in Amsterdam. Mr. Samuel Oppenheim adds something to our knowledge of Jacob

Barsimson, the first Jewish settler in New York (1654). Rev. Dr. David Philipson contributes some interesting letters of Rebecca Gratz. Mr. Max J. Kohler an important body of material respecting the Board of Delegates of American Israelites, 1859-1878, the predecessor of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. His appendixes include a general report (pp. 34) of the proceedings of the Board throughout its entire period of activity, prepared as a record by Myer S. Isaacs, successively its secretary and president. The operations of the Board in caring for general Jewish interests in America and abroad give this report special value. Another appendix presents correspondence between Myer S. Isaacs and General B. F. Butler in 1864. Mr. Leon Huhner adds a body of notes on the Jews of North Carolina prior to 1800; and there is an extensive group of obituary notes.

*Notes on the Life and Works of Bernard Romans.* By P. Lee Phillips, Custodian of Maps in the Library of Congress. [Publications of the Florida State Historical Society, no. 2.] (Deland, Fla., the Society, 1924, pp. 128, and portfolio of maps.) Bernard Romans's map of Florida, put forth in 1775 in two large sheets, one of them  $24\frac{1}{2}$  inches by 87, the other  $57\frac{3}{4}$  by  $66\frac{1}{2}$ , as an accompaniment to his *Concise Natural History of East and West Florida*, is so rare that only one copy of it, that in the Library of Congress, appears to be known. It is however of fundamental importance to the history of Florida cartography, as representing the first adequate portrayal of the coast line based on scientific observations and deliberate exploration. The Florida State Historical Society has therefore been well advised in giving this map an early place among its publications. It is reproduced in the original size, by planograph process, on thirteen sheets enclosed in a portfolio. The *Notes* are only an accompaniment to the map, but the late Mr. Phillips had collected them with great industry during past years, and presents the full texts of many newspaper advertisements and other contemporary documents illustrative of the preparation of the map and of Romans's career. At the end is a careful bibliography of Romans's writings and the full text of the description of West Florida written by him on a manuscript map of 1772 which is in the library of the Colonial Office in London. The history of his 1774 map is sufficiently set forth. On his life Mr. Phillips was able to obtain information for only the period from 1766 to 1783. He missed the letter from Romans to Dr. Williamson and that from De Brahm to Dartmouth respecting him which are in the calendar of the Dartmouth Papers, and seems in his account of Romans's controversy with Dr. Andrew Turnbull regarding New Smyrna not to have known of Miss Carita Doggett's book on Turnbull and New Smyrna, published at Jacksonville in 1921. There are great defects in the arrangement of the book which make it difficult to use, and there is no index. Mr. Phillips's general remarks on Romans's character and career are conventional.

*The Panic of 1837: Some Financial Problems of the Jacksonian Era.* By Reginald Charles McGrane, Professor of History in the University of Cincinnati. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1924, pp. vii, 260, \$2.00.) The contest between Nicholas Biddle and the Bank of the United States on the one hand and Jackson and Van Buren, Democratic presidents, on the other is the central theme of this collection of essays. A brief account is first given of economic conditions throughout the United States. Banking, farming, manufacturing, cotton-raising, trading, and state enterprises in canal and railroad building are surveyed. The mania for speculation in land is then discussed and with it the Specie Circular and the opposing views of Biddle and Van Buren. The next chapter narrates Biddle's manoeuvres to secure for the bank a charter from the state of Pennsylvania. A discussion of the effect of the panic upon industry and finance is followed by an account of the political happenings that came in its wake. The sixth chapter considers the policy of the bank toward the resumption of specie payment. The author presents Biddle's case but does not attempt to conceal his skillfulness in politics as well as banking. The last chapter briefly gives the story of Van Buren's determined fight for the Independent Treasury. His chief antagonist was Nicholas Biddle.

Obviously this little book is not meant to be a definitive study of politics and finance in the 'thirties. It is a good beginning of what can be made a notable contribution to the literature of American history. One could wish that the author had avoided prejudice by delaying publication until he could present the matured results of his research with more comprehensive and exhaustive treatment. In ranging about his central theme, he has not been able to give adequate consideration to any one of his problems. He has brought out side-lights, but they have blurred the vision of the reader. They are stronger than the main stream of illumination.

The impression is left that the author looked up from hours of fascinated reading in the papers of Nicholas Biddle to ponder the problems which he wished to discuss. He is, to be sure, frank to say that Biddle played the game of politics; but it seems to the reviewer that, before Mr. McGrane laid the chief blame for the financial distress of the 'thirties at the door of the Jacksonian administration, he should have read Nathan Appleton's *Currency and Banking* (1841) and excerpts from the diary of that Whig financier (see R. C. Winthrop's "Memoir of Nathan Appleton", Massachusetts Historical Society *Proceedings*, V. 249). There is room for the opinion that Biddle's policy of contracting and expanding the loans of the Bank of the United States was capricious. It may have been as harmful to the country as the "blundering mistakes of the government".

ARTHUR B. DARLING.

*A History of the Town of Middlefield, Massachusetts.* By Edward Church Smith and Philip Mack Smith, with the assistance of Theodore

Clarke Smith. (Menasha, Wis., privately printed, 1924, pp. xxv, 662.) This is a history of a Massachusetts village that never had a population of over 877. Owing, however, to the able manner in which it has been written the book possesses considerable value for the historian in a wider field. It is not necessary here to discuss the minutiae of local matters, the account of which is full and apparently accurate. The point of interest for the historian is that here we have a carefully worked-out analysis, from the economic and social standpoints, of a characteristic New England "hill town" from its settlement to the present day.

Beginning with the large land grant, sold off in part to settlers and in part occupied by the inevitable squatters, its development is traced from its first form as a scattered farming community on the colonial frontier. Then come the change in favor of stock-raising, the beginning of manufacturing, the great prosperity following the Civil War, the decline, and the transformation into a summer colony. Very few local histories give such a complete and detailed story of the entire economic life of any community. There are some exceedingly interesting population tables. One shows the origin of three-quarters of the first settlers, tracing them from fifty-three other towns. Others give the changes in population. Although the town was founded in the Revolutionary period, the exodus began on a heavy scale even before 1790. From 1820 to 1870 the numbers remained stationary, when another period of heavy emigration set in, leaving the town, which had a population of 877 in 1800, only 280 in 1920. To a great extent the destinations of the emigrants are also given, so that we have what is almost a unique account of the origins of all the elements of the town, the ebb and flow of its prosperity and population, and the distribution of its influence in other parts of the country.

Much space is given to a detailed description of its architectural changes. There are 250 pages of local genealogies. The maps and illustrations are good and there is an index, mainly of proper names. The book is an excellent example of the value of a local history when written by persons having competent knowledge of its wider interests and implications. At the same time the local point of view is strictly maintained, and the authors have not been led into the temptation of including what properly belongs to general history rather than to their local field.

JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS.

*Virginia War History in Newspaper Clippings.* Arthur Kyle Davis, Editor. [Publications of the Virginia War History Commission, Source Volume II.] (Richmond, 1924, pp. lxx, 453.) Essentially, this is a classified list of some 25,000 clippings from twenty-five Virginia newspapers of war time, industriously brought together by the workers for the Virginia War History Commission, of which Mr. Davis is the chairman. The work seems to be thoroughly well done. To transcribe any one bit will show the system:



- Amherst prepares for Victory Loan drive. T.D. 5-11-19; 104  
 Anderson, Col. H. W., guest of Thos. N. Page in Rome. 5-5-19; 109  
 Animals treated kindly in army. N.L. 1-16-19; 20  
 Appomattox oversubscribes Liberty Loan quota. T.D. 5-11-19; 118  
 Armenian Relief appeal by Claude R. Davenport. N.L. 5-13-19; 120  
 Army recruiting in Richmond leads state. T.D. 5-1-19; 106

wherein the notations indicate newspaper, date, and number of clipping. The categories include pre-war conditions, drafts and military organizations, camps and cantonments, the activities of communities, churches, colleges, schools, the Red Cross, etc. A very clever preface explains the plan, and defends the result as a photographic exhibit in detail of the state's war-time history. Much of the collected material to which the book guides the reader will no doubt help some historian; much of it is a chronicle of small beer. To say that the list, especially the part that rests on editorials, will guide to a knowledge of public opinion is to claim too much for the newspaper. For the most part, American newspapers seem to be written by men and women who have barely learned to write, for the delectation of men and women who have just learned to read. Their parrot-like editorials do not securely indicate the opinions of either the thinking element or the others, if the others can properly be said to have opinions on public affairs.

*A History of Florida, from the Treaty of 1763 to our own Times.* By Caroline Mays Brevard. Edited by James Alexander Robertson. Volume I. *From the Treaty of 1763 to the Admission to Statehood.* [Publications of the Florida State Historical Society, no. IV.] (Deland, Fla., the Society, 1924, pp. xxi, 293.) Ordinarily a state historical society will not undertake to publish narrative histories of the state, but peculiar circumstances attend the manuscript left by the late Miss Brevard. What she wrote on the first Spanish period, extending to 1763, could be passed over, for the great masses of wholly new material which the society is acquiring from the archives of Seville will compel the history of Florida in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to be totally rewritten, indeed will for the first time enable it to be written in any true sense. But from 1783, where (and not at all from 1763) the present volume begins, and especially from the cession to the United States in 1819, Miss Brevard had means of knowledge that give to this posthumous publication much of the value of an original source. The granddaughter of General R. K. Call, territorial delegate and governor, she had been brought up in the best traditions of the state's history, had all her life (1860-1920) been deeply interested in it, and, a teacher of history in the Florida State College for Women, knew how to take a broad, external view of her theme, and to treat it without provinciality. She writes competently and with full knowledge, and very pleasantly, of political affairs, of international complications, of Indian relations and wars, of social life, and of education. The volume ends with 1845. In appendixes various important

documents are printed, and the editor, Dr. Robertson, who has supplied many valuable annotations to the text, adds an excellent account of the materials for Florida history in this later period.

*The Correspondence of Lieut.-Gov. John Graves Simcoe, with Allied Documents relating to his Administration of the Government of Upper Canada.* Collected and edited by Brig.-Gen. E. A. Cruikshank, LL.D., F.R.S.C., for the Ontario Historical Society. Volume I., 1789-1793; volume II., 1793-1794. (Toronto, the Society, 1923, 1924, pp. xv, 443, xv, 470.) No student of either Canadian history or its relations to the history of the United States in the years covered by these volumes should fail to know of them, or to make full use of their contents. The two (there will apparently be a third) embrace some 800 documents. Of these, rather more than 200 are letters of the redoubtable Simcoe, 200 more are letters to him; the rest come in as illustrative matter. When once the editor of a public man's correspondence proceeds beyond the letters from him and to him, it is difficult to close the gate, and General Cruikshank has included a great deal of illustrative matter, the connection of which with Simcoe's administration is not always close. However, the mass of matter presented for the historian's use is too great and too valuable to permit the student to quarrel with a certain want of strictness of definition in the composition of the volume. More pointed criticism might be directed upon the method of editing. Where a letter or document is taken from some printed volume—*Michigan Historical Collections, Writings of Jefferson*, newspapers, etc.—as many are, the provenance seems to be carefully noted; but most of the pieces are derived from original documents or transcripts in the Public Archives of Canada, and these are not furnished with any sort of reference; and the Ross Robertson transcripts of Simcoe's papers, now in that repository and obviously the source of a large part of the two books, are well known to be far from accurate copies. Still, as was said at an earlier point in this notice, the student must be grateful for the wealth of material here given him, and the American student quite as much as the Canadian, for indeed the documents selected illustrate the relations between the two countries rather more thoroughly than the internal administration of Upper Canada.

*Thomas Chandler Haliburton ("Sam Slick"): a Study in Provincial Toryism.* By V. L. O. Chittick, Ph.D., Professor in the Division of Literature and Language at Reed College. [Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature.] (New York, Columbia University Press, 1924, pp. xi, 695, \$4.00.) In this admirable study, Haliburton—the man, the politician, and the author—is portrayed with something more than academic sufficiency.

As a biography, it can hardly be superseded. Although the outlines of Haliburton's character have been sketched by others and although Professor Chittick has added nothing that is likely to alter them, he has con-

tributed the needed details to complete the portrait. Especially illuminating are the extracts from letters and diaries.

Although Professor Chittick has drawn a fascinating picture of an interesting figure, the subtitle emphasizes his absorption in the political aspects of Haliburton's career. In fact, he has chosen to write as a student of history rather than as a student of literature. As such, he has produced a monograph of enduring value. Those who may question the propriety of devoting nearly seven hundred pages to a lawyer and a judge who was at best only a minor statesman even in Nova Scotia may well recall that Haliburton was a representative Tory gentleman. Excellent as is the work of Canadian historians, it has lacked the kind of background which Professor Chittick has so brilliantly supplied. His dissertation shows how any movement such as confederation is affected by personal aspirations and animosities.

In his treatment of Haliburton as a man and as a politician, Professor Chittick has handled his material with unquestionable skill. In his treatment of Haliburton as an author, he has been less successful. Although he has solved many problems, he has failed to grasp the significance of the peddler's popularity. In his anxiety to destroy the mythical Haliburton whom he has created, he is often misleading and sometimes inaccurate. To-day no one believes that Haliburton was "the father of American humor" except in the sense that he gave international currency to a type that had been provincially American. His chief sources—those which Professor Chittick says have been "consistently ignored"—have long been known among scholars. Others, with which he is evidently unfamiliar, have recently been discovered. Sam is much more of a composite than he suspects.

Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that several chapters are inconclusive, the flaws in his argument are not due to his methods. In thoroughness, completeness, and directness, the volume is worthy of the highest praise. It is a credit to both author and publisher.

RAY PALMER BAKER.

*The History of Munitions Supply in Canada, 1914-1918.* By David Carnegie, C.B.E., M.Inst.C.E., F.R.S.E. (London and New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1925, pp. xxvii, 336, 18 s.) The author of this considerable volume was ordnance adviser to the two organizations which were successively responsible for the supply of munitions from Canada to the British government during the Great War. Besides his personal knowledge of their efforts and difficulties, he has had access to official documents and to some extent his work may be regarded as an official history. In response to a cablegram from Lord Kitchener to the Minister of Militia on August 24, 1914, a committee on shells was formed of four manufacturers and three military officers. Its duties were not stated, nor did it receive any instructions beyond a direction to supply shells as fast as possible. The relations of its members, who were manu-

facturers, to the British and Canadian governments were never clearly defined, but they entered into a contract with the Minister of Militia, to whom at the same time they acted as advisers. This anomalous situation finally provoked keen criticism and led to their resignation. It was an active, masterful body, which accepted large responsibilities and accomplished much. In less than seven months 155 factories, employing 25,000 workers, were producing munitions in Canada under its direction. Orders for munitions were the means of introducing five new industries; many others were stimulated; mining and refining of metals received a remarkable impulse. High wages and high prices for material were paid, yet the terms of the contracts were so advantageous that the manufacturers made great profits of which little is said. Factories were built or converted in nearly every town in all the provinces of the Dominion until the number was increased to 381. Mr. Carnegie writes: "Those who had dormant mines or saleable products placed them at the disposal of the Shell Committee and Imperial Munitions Board. From north, south, east, and west they flocked to Montreal and Ottawa. This personal necessity, stimulated by patriotic emotion, released human energies which had been suppressed by the stagnant conditions of trade" (p. 67).

Within a year the Shell Committee was conducting what Mr. D. A. Thomas said "was probably the biggest business in the Empire". Mr. Carnegie is discreetly reticent as to the adverse criticism and investigations which led to the resignation of its members and the formation of an Imperial Munitions Board, directly responsible to the British Ministry of Munitions. Over sixteen millions of dollars were refunded to the War Office as the profit on its transactions. The chairman of that committee and the chairman of the new board, which succeeded a year later in mobilizing the manufactures of Canada for the production of war *material* almost as completely as those of the British Isles, are particularly eulogized. Special chapters deal with the steel problem, the problems of machining shells, cartridge-case manufacture, the production of toluol and T.N.T., the establishment of national factories for the manufacture of fuses, explosives, and shell forgings, aviation, aeroplane manufacture, tree felling, co-operation with the United States, the inspection of munitions, and munition workers, giving copious statistics in each case; and the volume ends with one on the value of the munitions business to Canadian industry. The author affirms that it produced an increased development of natural resources, the standardization of products, and the standardization of skill. The book is an important contribution to the economic history of the war. Some obvious errors have been noted, which may be due to faulty proof-reading, and the index is certainly inadequate.

E. A. CRUKSHANK.

*L'Évolution Historique du Mexique.* Par Emilio Rabasa, Professeur à l'École Libre de Droit de Mexico. Traduction de Carlos Docteur; Préface de Ernest Martinenche, Professeur à la Sorbonne. (Paris, Félix

Alcan, 1924, pp. xii, 345, 12 fr.) This is a free but spirited and on the whole faithful translation of the original Mexico edition of 1921. Rabasa, the acknowledged dean of Mexican jurisconsults and keen student of history, analyzes the influences which have created his nation and sets forth its problems with offerings of probable solutions.

The thesis may be condensed into few words. The formative period of Mexican history, running through the presidency of Juárez, saw the creation of a mixed population in which the half-breed group is dominant politically and socially. They have a fierce patriotism born of attachment to their soil, their mixed traditions, and their struggles. The struggle for independence was a social conflict to which Hidalgo contributed the arousing of the masses and Morelos a military character. The prolongation of the conflict resulted in anarchy, and achievement of separation by the element which sought the restoration of the old social order. From that moment until 1857 ensued a confused period in which the essential problem was the elimination of the Church from political control. The process was delayed by the foreign intervention, but out of the conflict rose a sense of nationality. Since that time all political struggle has been in the name of the constitution, not to impose new bases of government. But the constitution made the mistake of conceding manhood suffrage to an alphabet populace, with the result that farcical elections superinduce dictatorships. No president of Mexico has ever been able to deny that his election was illegal, though some have based their sway on popular acquiescence. Díaz was the outstanding example. The remedy is not to be found in restriction of the ballot, but in education of public opinion.

The writer exalts the beneficent aspects of the Díaz rule and even asserts that it was without despotism; indeed he is a pronounced apologist for the old régime. Written some five years ago, the book is in some respects a reflection of the popular feelings in the United States and Mexico at that time. Thus there is little appreciation for the hopeful aspects of the revolution. There is reference, now untimely, to the existence of anti-Mexican propaganda in this country, and iteration of the habitual Mexican view that the southern republic is the frontier of Latin civilization on the Western continent, with a special heaven-sent mission to preserve its own culture against Saxon infiltration. This is rather a limping, diffuse conclusion to a work of merit in those parts in which the author could express whole-souled approval or historical impartiality.

HERBERT I. PRIESTLEY.

*American Relations with Mexico.* By Launa M. Smith, A.M. (Oklahoma City, Okla., Harlow Publishing Company, 1924, pp. vii, 249, \$2.00.) The period treated is that lying between the rise of Madero and the middle of the year 1919. Forty-eight introductory pages are dedicated to a summary view of the century of Mexican independence and the general condition of the country in 1910. The principal interest is in the various intervention policies acted upon by the government of the United States. Ac-

quiescence in the popular demand for intervention during the Madero period would have meant a costly war, in which this country would have forfeited the respect of Latin America. Non-importation of arms, provided for by joint resolution of Congress on March 14, 1912, caused complications during the Huerta and Carranza periods which seem to the writer to have indicated an inconsistent American policy. Non-recognition of Huerta is faintly defended for its expediency rather than censured on the basis of American precedent in international relations or praised on the grounds of international morality. The recognition of Carranza is held premature, although it is admitted that, by refusing to accept dictation from the American government, Carranza "did more to make Mexico independent from an international standpoint than any ruler Mexico has had before or since his time" (p. 185).

The episodes of the stormy period, such as the Tampico incident, the Santa Isabel massacre, and the Pershing expedition, are discussed from the viewpoint of the border resident of the United States. A survey of the effect of the constitution of 1917 upon foreign relations devotes overmuch space to its labor provisions, at the expense of treatment of the land and petroleum controversies caused by article XXVII.

The author's style is didactic. Naïve ethical judgments are often presented instead of historical ones. Citations of authorities are too infrequent. The bibliography omits many pertinent works. Some of those included, with titles in translation, are unidentifiable. The work is useful in that it preserves in convenient form a record of popular border opinion concerning the revolution, with some of the comment elicited in the United States Congress by the march of events.

H. I. PRIESTLEY.

*Antonio José de Sucre, Gran Mariscal de Ayacucho, Hero and Martyr of American Independence: a Sketch of his Life.* By Guillermo A. Sherwell. (Washington, D. C., privately printed, 1924, pp. viii, 236.) Another volume has been added to the short list of books in English which are concerned with the struggles of the Spanish-American colonists for independence. Having published a booklet on Bolívar, the Liberator, Professor Sherwell then elected to write a brief biography of General Sucre, another member of the so-called Venezuelan trinity. The author's purpose was to inform North American readers of history about the deeds of a distinguished leader of the revolutionary period, *par excellence*, of Spanish-American history.

This biography possesses merits and defects of a work of vulgarization. From a study of books, pamphlets, and articles dealing with the Spanish-American revolution the biographer has composed the longest account in English of Sucre's life and deeds. Here and there the text is enlivened by quotations which are mainly extracted from the voluminous documentary collection concerning Simón Bolívar that was given the misnomer of *Memorias del General O'Leary*. Bolívar's estimate of his faith-

ful comrade-in-arms is allowed to monopolize one of Sherwell's last chapters. A conclusion which is not inappropriately entitled "Sucre's Message" furnishes an interesting analysis of the hero's public and private career. It is in the last part of the booklet that the author rises to a stylistic height which is worthy of his noble subject. Some of the illustrations which adorn this book have not hitherto been utilized by Sucre's biographers. A few foot-notes direct the curious and unversed reader to sources of the author's information. Although he apparently received assistance from Venezuelan correspondents in the assembling of data and although he has made some additions to our knowledge about South America's heroic age, yet his bibliography contains no mention of inedited documents concerning the grand epic of Spanish-American history.

WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON.



## HISTORICAL NEWS

It is intended that a general index to vols. XXI.-XXX. of this journal, prepared on the same plan as the two preceding decennial indexes, shall be published in the autumn. Copies of those earlier general indexes can still be obtained from the publishers of this journal.

Mention was made in a previous number of an agreement with the (English) Historical Association whereby a supply of certain of their pamphlets would be sent to the office of this journal, to be distributed thence to members of the American Historical Association who might desire them. We recur to the matter in order to say that copies of the pamphlet by Professor C. K. Webster and Mr. Harold Temperley, *The Congress of Vienna, 1814-1815, and the Conference of Paris, 1919*, and that of Sir Charles Firth on *Historical Novels* are still available, and will be sent to any members who may send their addresses for the purpose.

### AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The American Historical Association has been granted a subvention by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial of \$25,000, to be employed in the interests of the International Committee of Historical Sciences, which is now in process of organization as an outcome of the Brussels Congress. Of the total amount \$10,000 is to be used for the organization and general expenses of the International Committee between the present time and the next international congress, in 1928, and \$15,000 is allotted to the project for an International Year Book of Historical Bibliography, which was adopted by the provisional international committee in 1924, and which will, in a sense, be the continuation of the *Jahresberichte der Geschichtswissenschaft*, the publication of which ceased with the volumes for 1912. It is proposed to hold a meeting for the definitive organization of the International Committee this autumn, and it is probable that that meeting will also serve as an occasion to determine the time and place of the next international historical congress.

For that important enterprise of the American Council of Learned Societies, the proposed *Dictionary of American Biography*, the Committee of Management has been so fortunate as to secure the services, as general editor, of Dr. Allen Johnson, professor of American history in Yale University, and formerly editor of the series called *Chronicles of America*. Yale University releases him in February next for full conduct of the enterprise.

## THE ENDOWMENT FUND

The following announcement is presented, on behalf of the Committee on Endowment, by its chairman, Professor Evarts B. Greene, of Columbia University:

"The Committee on the Endowment is able at this time to present only a brief report of progress, in which the most important item is the decision, approved by the Executive Council, to increase the amount to be asked for from \$200,000 to \$450,000. The raising of the latter amount would provide a total endowment of half a million dollars, a very modest sum in view of the national responsibilities of the Association, but sufficient to make possible a substantial enlargement of its services, especially along the lines of publication and co-operative research. The Committee is convinced that an enterprise on this scale requires more careful preliminary organization than was at first contemplated, and has, accordingly, decided to postpone the active canvass until the autumn. More definite announcements may be expected before long.

"The Committee expects to profit largely by the advice and co-operation of persons outside of the active membership, and by the generosity of public-spirited citizens who are able to make larger gifts than are possible to most members of the Association. Nevertheless its main reliance must be upon the hearty support of those who best know the work already done for American historical scholarship and can best appreciate the kinds of service which the proposed endowment will make possible. In short, the success of this enterprise will depend in large part upon the extent to which members of the Association generally are willing to share with the members of the Committee the responsibility of making sure that this important forward step is really taken."

## PERSONAL

Dr. George Burton Adams, professor emeritus in Yale University, died on May 26, at the age of nearly seventy-four. He had been professor of history in Drury College from 1877 to 1888, and in Yale University from 1888 till his retirement in 1917. His first important publication was a book on *Civilization during the Middle Ages* (1894), followed in 1896 by one on *The Growth of the French Nation*, and in 1899 by *An Outline of European History*; but his main interest was in the constitutional history of England, especially in that of the thirteenth century. He was the author of the second volume (1905) of Hunt and Poole's *Political History of England*, the volume relating to the period from 1066 to 1216, of a volume on *The Origin of the English Constitution* (1912), and of one on *The Constitutional History of England* (1921) in the series of volumes edited by Professor Haskins and published by Holt. His views respecting the constitutional history of the thirteenth century, often first set forth in articles in this journal, received wide acceptance and some dissent, but certainly were expounded with great learning and clearness of thought and expression. He was a member of the Council of the American Historical Association from 1891 to 1897 and from 1898 to

1901, and was president of the Association during the year 1908. From the inception of this journal, in 1895, he was continuously chairman of its Board of Editors until 1913. His services to the Association and to the *Review* were of the greatest value. He signally aided the Executive Council of the Association, in critical years, by sound judgment, wisdom and consideration in all dealings with others, effective energy, and common sense; and the debt which the *Review*, especially in the first years following its establishment, owes to these qualities and to his careful and devoted service is greater than can be imagined by the present public. He was a man of transparent integrity, and a good friend.

During the absence in South America next year of Professor C. H. Haring of Harvard University, the courses in Latin American history will be given by Professor C. W. Hackett of the University of Texas.

In October last, Mr. Edward F. Rowse of St. Louis was appointed head of the Manuscripts and History Section of the New York State Library, to succeed Mr. Peter Nelson, transferred to the Archives and History Division of the New York State Education Department.

Professor J. F. Baldwin of Vassar College will have leave of absence during the next academic year. Miss Isobel B. Thornley of the University of London will give courses in English history in Vassar throughout the year.

Professor Robert McElroy of Princeton has been elected to the Harmsworth professorship of American history in the University of Oxford.

During the absence of Professor Lingelbach from the University of Pennsylvania throughout the first half of the next academic year, which he plans to spend in Europe, his place will be taken by Professor Herbert C. Bell of Bowdoin College.

Professors W. W. Pierson, jr., and F. P. Graham of the University of North Carolina, who have been on leave of absence, will return to their duties next autumn.

A. T. Volwiler of Wittenberg College will take the place of Professor A. L. Kohlmeier at Indiana State University during the latter's leave of absence for the academic year 1925-1926. Professor Volwiler will also teach in the summer school of the University of West Virginia.

Dr. Arthur L. Dunham of the University of Michigan has been advanced to an assistant professorship, and has also been granted leave of absence during the year 1925-1926, which he will spend in European study and travel.

Professors I. J. Cox of Northwestern University and J. F. Rippey of the University of Chicago will lecture at Stanford University in the autumn and spring quarters, respectively. Professor P. A. Martin of that university will be on leave of absence during the entire year, which he will spend in study and travel in Europe and in South America.

Dr. Paul B. Schaeffer of Harvard University has been appointed assistant professor of European history in the University of California for the year 1925-1926, to take the place of Professor L. J. Paetow, who will spend a sabbatical year in Paris.

Professor John C. Parish of the University of California, Southern Branch, has gone to Europe for the summer and the first semester of the approaching academic year, on leave of absence; Professor F. J. Klingberg of the same institution has leave for the second semester, and will spend it in England.

We note promotions and appointments as follows: A. H. Basye of Dartmouth College to be professor of English history, and H. D. Jordan of Harvard University to be assistant professor of American history, in Dartmouth College; S. E. Morison and A. M. Schlesinger, to be professors of history in Harvard; E. C. Kirkland of Brown University, to be assistant professor of history; Mikhail Rostovtseff of Wisconsin, to be professor of ancient history at Yale; M. L. W. Laistner, formerly reader in ancient history in the University of London, to be professor of ancient history in Cornell University; Samuel Rezneck, to be professor of history and social science in Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; E. M. Earle, to be assistant professor of history in Barnard College; John Musser and J. H. Park of New York University, to be professor and assistant professor of history, respectively; R. J. Sontag of Princeton University, to be assistant professor of history; R. F. Nichols of Columbia University, to be assistant professor of history in the University of Pennsylvania; F. J. Wing of Yale University, to be assistant professor of history in Swarthmore College; J. E. Swain of the University of Pennsylvania, to be assistant professor of history in Muhlenberg College; C. P. Higby of the University of North Carolina, to be professor of history; R. H. Shryock of the University of Pennsylvania, to be assistant professor of history in Duke University; R. H. McLean of Emory University, to be professor of history, and F. B. Simkins of the University of North Carolina, to be assistant professor of history in Emory; A. C. Krey and L. B. Shippee of the University of Minnesota, to be professors of history; Alexander Vassilieff of the University of Leningrad, to be professor of ancient history in the University of Wisconsin; R. B. Mowat, head tutor in Corpus Christi College, Oxford, to be for one year professor of modern history in the University of Wisconsin; E. H. Byrne of the University of Wisconsin, to be professor of medieval history; Paul Knaplund and Carl Stephenson of the same university, to be associate professors, and J. L. Sellers assistant professor of history; W. T. Root of the University of Wisconsin, to be head of the department of history in the University of Iowa; E. M. Eriksson of Lombard College, to be professor of American history and head of department in Coe College; G. H. Guttridge of Cambridge, England, to be assistant professor of modern European history in the University of California; F. J. Klingberg and

J. B. Lockey of the University of California, Southern Branch, to be professor and associate professor of history, respectively; R. H. Harvey and L. K. Koontz of the same university, to be assistant professors of history; E. M. Hulme of Stanford University, to be professor of history.

The following appointments for summer schools are noted, additional to those mentioned in our last number: Professors H. E. Barnes of Smith College, H. C. Bell of Bowdoin College, W. K. Boyd of Duke University, W. W. Hyde of the University of Pennsylvania, and Miss Emily Hickman of Wells College are to teach in Cornell University; W. T. Laprade of Duke University, in the University of Pennsylvania; S. J. Buck, S. B. Harding, and L. B. Shippee of the University of Minnesota, in the University of Wisconsin, Colorado State Teachers College, and the University of Michigan, respectively; Percy S. Flippin of Mercer University, in the University of West Virginia; Frederick J. Turner, in the Agricultural College of Utah; St. George L. Sioussat of the University of Pennsylvania, in the University of Southern California; J. M. Callahan of West Virginia, in the Southern Branch of the University of California.

In the first award, of fifteen fellowships for European study on the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, two historical scholars are included: Miss Violet Barbour, of Vassar College, for the completion of a life of Sir George Downing, begun by the late Professor R. C. H. Catterall, and Professor Allen B. West, of Wheaton College, for further study of Athenian tribute lists.

#### GENERAL

The April number of the *Historical Outlook* contains an article, read at Richmond in December, by Professor W. W. Sweet on Pertinent Fields for Research in Colleges; one by D. L. Stone on America's Share of German Reparations; and one by E. N. Johnson on the Birth of the European System of Alliances. In the May number Professor Charles H. Haskins discusses the broad subject of History in the threefold aspect of history as a body of knowledge, as a method of inquiry, and as a point of view; S. M. Levin discourses upon History and the Panorama of Life; and Professor J. C. Almack upon the Shibboleth of the Frontier.

The April number of *History* has a paper on the Gift of Historical Thinking, by the Bishop of Durham; one on the Allegory of Robinson Crusoe, by Dr. George Parker; one on The Making of Bulgaria, by W. A. Gauld; and one on Holland and England during the War of the Austrian Succession, by Professor P. Geyl, of the University of London.

The *Bulletin* of the John Rylands Library of Manchester for January contains an important review, by Professor C. H. Herford, of the History of Shakespeare's Influence on the Continent; a penetrating and even brilliant lecture on the Soul of Cities, by the Earl of Crawford, chancellor of the University of Manchester; learned and ingenious papers by Dr. J.

Rendel Harris on Scylla and Charybdis and on the Sources of Barlaam and Joasaph; and a Study in Twelfth-Century Religious Revival and Reform, by Miss Alice M. Cooke of Newnham College.

The *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society for the meeting of October, 1923, the last section published, contains some notes on Rev. Richard Mather's *Church Government* (1643) but otherwise is almost entirely occupied with the second installment (1808-1815, pp. 142) of the letters of Rev. Samuel Taggart, M. C. from Massachusetts, a valuable month-to-month Federalist record of political doings in Washington.

The April number of the *Catholic Historical Review* recounts the proceedings of the fifth annual meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, and presents the presidential address then delivered by Dr. Henry J. Ford.

In the April number of the *Journal of Negro History* Professor Frederick Starr, anthropologist of the University of Chicago, discourses of Liberia after the World War; Mr. L. P. Jackson narrates the history of the Origin of Hampton Institute; Mr. C. S. S. Higham of the University of Manchester presents a brief statement of the Negro Policy of Christopher Codrington, governor of the Leeward Islands 1698-1703. The bulk of the number however (pp. 158) is filled with the texts of letters to the American Colonization Society (1818-1856) from negroes who thought of migrating to Liberia, and who often describe in detail their situation, in slavery or in freedom, and that of others around them.

*Europäische Gespräche* is a valuable monthly publication, edited by A. Mendelssohn Bartholdy under the auspices of the Hamburg Institut für Auswärtige Politik and published by the Deutsche Verlagsanstalt at Stuttgart. It is now entering on its third year and contains articles and documents, illustrative of recent and contemporary history. The February number has a useful *Bibliographie zur Auswärtigen Politik*, compiled from publications of the year 1924 and excellently classified.

A recent publication of the League of Nations, which should be of value to students of contemporary history, is the *Index Bibliographicus; Répertoire Internationale des Sources de Bibliographie Courante (Périodiques et Institutions)*, prepared under the oversight of Marcel Godet, director of the Swiss National Library (Paris, Berger, 1925, pp. 233).

The *Papers*, vol. XVII., pt. II. (1923), of the Bibliographical Society of America is a Bibliography of Literature describing Books printed between 1501 and 1601, prepared by James B. Childs. It contains 402 titles.

In the series called *The History of Civilization*, edited by C. K. Ogden of Magdalen College, Cambridge, and published in Great Britain by Messrs. Kegan Paul, and in New York by Alfred A. Knopf, English translations of four of the volumes taken from M. Henri Berr's series called *L'Évolution de l'Humanité* have been brought out, namely, translations of Edmond Perrier's *La Terre avant l'Histoire*, Lucien Febvre's *La*

*Terre et l'Évolution Humaine*, Jacques de Morgan's *L'Humanité Pré-historique*, and J. Vendryes's *Le Langage: Introduction Linguistique à l'Histoire*. The French books have already been reviewed in this journal (XXVIII. 347, 291, XXVII. 539, 772). Many additional volumes, not in the Berr series, are to be added, rather at the expense of unity. Among them are several from Renard's French series on life and labor in different periods, Adolph Reichwein's *China und Europa* (eighteenth century), Miss Dorothy George's *London Life in the Eighteenth Century*, Professor E. H. Parker's *A Thousand Years of the Tartars*, and *The Foundations of Western Civilization*, by V. Gordon Childe; also the book of M. Labriolle reviewed above (p. 798).

The various *Histoires Générales*, which have been for some time in course of preparation in France, are now appearing at a rate which threatens to confuse the reader. M. Louis Halphen informs us that the dozen small volumes edited by M. Cavaignac are designed to form a brief guide for the orientation of students; the fifty large volumes which will comprise the series of M. Glotz are to serve as manuals for the Facultés d'Enseignement Supérieur; the twenty volumes to appear in the series of M. Halphen and M. Sagnac will furnish a synthetic view of human civilization in which the facts will be considered together; the three volumes of the *Histoire Générale* published by the Librairie Larousse under M. Maxime Petit's editorship are to be brief, illustrated summaries of separate civilizations for the use of the lycées; M. Berr's *Évolution de l'Humanité* is a collection of monographs rather than a consecutive history.

In our review of C. S. Leavenworth's *The Lessons of History* (XXX. 628-629) the Yale University Press is erroneously given as the publisher, whereas the work was merely printed by them for the author.

John S. Hoyland is the author of *A Brief History of Civilization*, which the Oxford University Press has published.

A new philosophical discussion of the function and concepts of history is to be found in *Staat, Gesellschaft, Kultur, und Geschichte* by Felix Rachfahl (Jena, Fischer, 1924, pp. 106).

The Pulitzer prize for the best book of American history published during the year 1924 has been awarded by the Columbia University School of Journalism to Professor Frederic L. Paxson for his *History of the American Frontier*. The prize for the best American biography has been awarded to Mr. M. A. DeWolfe Howe for his *Barrett Wendell and his Letters*.

The American Jewish Historical Society is already making intelligent and comprehensive plans for the annual meeting of June, 1926, which, held at Philadelphia, will endeavor to celebrate the whole relation of the American Jews to the American Revolution.

The Agricultural History Society has practically completed plans for the publication of a journal, and it is expected that the first number will be issued in the autumn.



The Prussian Institute at Rome has resumed, after ten years of suspension, the publication of its *Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, publishing now the second and concluding Heft of Band XVII. It contains the first part of an article by F. Schneider, "Untersuchungen zur Italienischen Verfassungsgeschichte", dealing with Byzantine imperial administration; one by the director, Professor Paul Kehr, "Kaiser Friedrich I. und Venedig während des Schismas", other articles, and a general list of the articles and documents published in the whole seventeen volumes. Of especial interest are Professor Kehr's annual reports on the work of the Institute, a record of courageous efforts to continue scholarly work, and of tragical difficulties. These still continue in such force that the Institute, while making some efforts to continue the *Nuntiaturberichte* and the *Repertorium Germanicum*, must in the main confine itself to the rôle of the chief agency by which German historical scholarship can be kept in touch with that of Italy and France. Subscriptions to the *Quellen und Forschungen* are of course ardently desired.

Thirty-one of the principal American students of bibliography have joined in contributions to a volume of *Bibliographical Essays: a Tribute to Wilberforce Eames* (Harvard University Press, 1924, pp. xxii, 440, purchasable through Mr. Lawrence C. Wroth, of the John Carter Brown Library). In this volume, worthily commemorating the services to scholarship of one who is *facile princeps* among the American bibliographers, will be found several papers of interest to students of history, such as that of Henry W. Kent on "Chez Moreau de St. Méry, Philadelphie"; that of Dr. Charles L. Nichols on the Literary Fair in the United States; that of George P. Winship on the Eliot Indian Tracts; that of Professor Verner W. Crane on the "Promotion Literature" of Georgia; that of Professor George L. Kittredge on Lovewell's Fight, and that of Mrs. Margaret Stillwell on Werner Rolewinck's *Fasciculus Temporum*.

*A History of Agriculture in Europe and America*, by Professor N. S. B. Gras of the University of Minnesota, has just been published by F. S. Crofts and Company.

*Our Nation's Heritage: What the Old World contributed to the New*, by Reuben P. Halleck and Juliette Frantz, is a volume in Halleck's *American History* series published by the American Book Company.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Georg von Below, *Ueber Historische Periodisierungen*, I, II. (*Archiv für Politik und Geschichte*, January, February); C. Barbagallo, *Che Cosa è il Materialismo Storico*, I. (*Nuova Rivista Storica*, November); H. E. Barnes, *The New History* (*American Mercury*, May); A. Henderson, *Civilization and Progress* (*Virginia Quarterly Review*, April); A. Kammerer, *La Mer Rouge à travers les Ages* (*Revue de Paris*, March 1); J. Kromayer, *Waren Hannibal und Friedrich der Grosse wirklich Ermüdungsstrategen?* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, CXXXI. 3); G. E. Hale, *The Oriental Ancestry of the Telescope* (*Scribner's Magazine*, April).

## ANCIENT HISTORY

The *Urgeschichtlicher Anzeiger* is a new international journal, devoted especially to the critical discussion of new publications in the field of prehistoric studies; it is edited by O. Menghin (Vienna, Schroll).

Beloit College will next year inaugurate in southwestern France a field training school for archaeologists, with working headquarters in a prehistoric cave in the Bordeaux region. Professor G. L. Collie will be its director. It is expected that about twelve students will be admitted to the school for the summer of 1926.

In the series bearing the general title *Our Debt to Greece and Rome*, edited by Professors George D. Hodgkins and David M. Robinson, recent issues are: *Sappho*, by Mr. Robinson; *Platonism and its Influence*, by Alfred E. Taylor; *Stoicism and its Influence*, by R. M. Wenley of Michigan; *Mythology*, by Miss Jane E. Harrison; *Architecture*, by Alfred M. Brooks of Indiana; and *Roman Private Life and its Survivals*, by Walton M. McDaniel of the University of Pennsylvania (Boston, Marshall Jones Company).

Among the publications of Weidmann, Berlin, for 1923-1924 are *Griechische und Griechisch-Demotische Ostraka der Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek zu Strassburg in Elsass*, edited by Paul Viereck; the first volume, *Texte*, contains 812 documents from the third century B. C. to the seventh century A. D. The same house offers the fourth and concluding volume of Johannes Kromayer's *Antike Schlachtfelder*, covering the Persian wars (pp. 170), and Felix Jacoby's *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, part I, *Genealogie und Mythographie* (pp. ix, 536).

*The Problem of Claudius*, a Johns Hopkins dissertation of 1916, by Dr. Thomas DeC. Ruth, just published, represents a careful and successful effort to interpret the character and clinical history of that singular person, in the light of modern medical and psychological knowledge. All the evidences are marshalled, and the conclusions are drawn with firmness and good sense, and with that balance of various factors which the theme requires. A leading element in the diagnosis is the belief in some sort of infantile or early paralysis, resulting in adult nervousness without mental unsoundness, but with many odd turns of mental conduct.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Count Byron Khun de Prorok, *Ancient Trade Routes from Carthage into the Sahara* (Geographical Review, April); Arthur Stein, *Partei-kämpfe im Hellenistischen Alexandrien* (Preussische Jahrbücher, April); P. Jouguet, *Une Lettre de l'Empereur Claude aux Alexandrins* (Journal des Savants, January).

## EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

The fourth edition of Karl Mirbt's standard *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des Römischen Katholizismus* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1924, pp. xxxii, 650) exceeds the third edition by some 150 pages, partly by reason

of various additions and improvements here and there, partly by bringing the series of documents down nearly to the present date by additions from recent pontificates.

An admirable work in the field of epigraphy is Ernest Diehl's *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1924, fasc. I.-III., pp. 240); the whole will be completed in fifteen parts and is based on 4700 titles, reaching to the beginning of the seventh century.

Mlle. Marguerite Van Berchem and M. Étienne Clouzot have given in their *Mosaïques Chrésiennes* (Geneva, Impr. Journal de Genève, 1924, pp. lxii, 254) one of the most available and complete classified collections of early medieval mosaics before the scholarly public; 432 photographic reproductions and a careful discussion of each object enhance the value of this work.

A learned and exhaustive treatise on a phase of the Monophysite controversy, hitherto inadequately studied, is that by René Draguet on *Julien d'Halicarnasse et sa Controverse avec Sévère d'Antioch sur l'Incorruptibilité du Corps du Christ*, a theological dissertation published by the University of Louvain (Louvain, Smeesters, 1924, pp. xi, 275, 78); it is based on 154 fragments of Bishop Julian's writings, which are printed in an appendix, in Syriac with Greek translations.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Ferd. Laun, *Die beiden Regeln des Basilios, ihre Echtheit und Entstehung* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, 1925, 1).

#### MEDIEVAL HISTORY

General review: E. Jordan, *Histoire Ecclésiastique du Moyen Age* (Revue Historique, March).

Professor James F. Willard, of the University of Colorado, has been able to give a somewhat enlarged scope to his third Bulletin on *Progress of Medieval Studies in the United States of America* (University of Colorado, pp. 37), through some additional support from the American Council of Learned Societies. Its list of medievalists, with notes of their publications and special lines of interest, is more numerous than heretofore, as is also its list of doctoral dissertations now in progress or lately completed. There are also notes of news, of which the most important is the announcement that, aided by a generous contribution from Mr. John Nicholas Brown, the American Council of Learned Societies' Committee on Medieval Latin Studies, with other associates, has resolved upon the founding of an American journal specially devoted to medieval studies, literary and historical. Professor Edward K. Rand of Harvard will be the general editor, assisted by Messrs. F. P. Magoun, jr. (Harvard), John Nicholas Brown, W. W. Lawrence (Columbia), Charles R. Morey (Princeton), Louis J. Paetow (California), Ernest H. Wilkins (Chicago), and Karl Young (Yale). The first number of this quarterly journal will appear next December.

The approaching twenty-fifth anniversary of M. Ferdinand Lot's instruction at the École Pratique des Hautes Études is to be marked by publication of a volume of *Mélanges consacrées à l'Histoire et à l'Histoire Littéraire du Moyen Age*, compiled by his former students and friends. The importance of this series of essays is evidenced by the names of the authors, who include among many others, MM. Bémont, Bloch, Brunel, Calmette, Halphen, Jorga, Pirenne, Powicke, Prou, and two Americans, Professor Haskins of Harvard and Miss D. M. Mackay of Mills College. The volume will be published by subscription only and will appear in November of this year. Foreign subscriptions, which should be made at once, will be received by Mr. Robert Fawtier, 10 Victoria Avenue, Didsbury, Manchester, England, acting for the publisher, Champion; the subscription is forty francs.

The Princeton University Press has lately published a *History of the Byzantine Empire* (pp. xi, 199) translated from the French work by Professor Charles Diehl of the University of Paris; also *Medieval Cities: their Origins and the Revival of Trade* (pp. ix, 249), by Professor Henri Pirenne of Ghent, based on lectures delivered by him while in this country.

Two volumes of papal documents are published by the firm of Boccard: *Lettres Communes des Papes d'Avignon*, fasc. 20, Jean XXII., by G. Mollet (Paris, 1925, pp. 210), and *Lettres Closes, Patentes, et Curiales*, fasc. 2, Clément VI., by E. Déprez (Paris, 1925, pp. 552).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Augustin Fliche, *L'Élection de Grégoire VII.* (Le Moyen Age, January-April, 1924-1925); Fr. Baethgen, *Franziskanische Studien* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXI. 3); Adrien Blanchet, *L'Hommage du Béarn à l'Angleterre, XIII<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> Siècles* (Le Moyen Age, January-April, 1924-1925).

#### MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Recent numbers of the *Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire Moderne* contain the following articles of general interest: (January) "Le Rôle du Journalisme dans la Diplomatie au XX<sup>e</sup> Siècle, d'après les Souvenirs de W. Steed", by Ch. Seignobos; (February) "Le Moyen Age dans l'Art Français du XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle", by René Lanson; (March) "Les Rapports entre la Démographie et l'Histoire", by Jean Bourdon; "La Misère, la Mendicité, et l'Assistance en Bretagne à la Fin de l'Ancien Régime", by Henri Sée; (April) "Les Sources de l'Histoire Contemporaine à la Société des Nations", by Paul Mantoux.

The third edition of Sir John A. R. Marriott's well-known and very useful *The Eastern Question: an Historical Study in European Diplomacy*, has an additional chapter or epilogue of 28 pages in which the events of 1917-1924 are recounted in considerable detail, though of course in a provisional manner.

A small publication of the Oxford University Press, *Europe Overseas* (pp. 144), by James A. Williamson, appearing in the series called *The*

*World Manuals*, can be recommended as an intelligent and interesting introduction to the general history of the colonial expansion of Europe.

*Diplomatic Relations between England and Spain, with special Reference to English Opinion, 1597-1603*, by Nathan G. Goodman, is issued in Philadelphia by the Westbrook Publishing Company.

Messrs. Longmans have brought out *Studies in the History of Political Philosophy before and after Rousseau*, in two volumes (vol. I., from Hobbes to Hume; vol. II., from Burke to Mazzini), by Professor Charles E. Vaughan, edited by Professor A. G. Little of the University of Manchester. The work constitutes nos. 166 and 167 of the *Publications of the University of Manchester*.

The Turin journal *Il Risorgimento Italiano* has published serially in vols. XVI. (1923) and XVII. (1924) an important body of material on the Conference of Laibach, consisting of its journals and the instructions and correspondence of the representatives of Sardinia, edited by Maria Avetta, and entitled "Al Congresso di Lubiano coi Ministri di Re Vittorio Emanuele I."

Two important contributions to the question of Russia's war guilt as seen through German eyes are *Der Diplomatische Schriftwechsel Iszwolskis 1911-14, aus den Geheimakten der Russischen Staatsarchive im Auftrage des Deutschen Auswärtigen Amtes in Deutscher Uebertragung herausgegeben von Friedr. Stieve* (Berlin, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, 1924, 4 vols., pp. 200, 411, 439, 139) and *Friedrich Stieve, Iszwolski und der Weltkrieg, auf Grund der Neuen Dokumentenveröffentlichung des Deutschen Auswärtigen Amtes* (*ibid.*, 1924, pp. 269).

In order to provide better facilities for an intensive study of contemporaneous history, since 1919, there has been created as an adjunct to the Bibliothèque-Musée de la Guerre an Office de Documentation Internationale Contemporaine. Commencing with 1925 the Office compiles and publishes a monthly *Bulletin*, of about 25 pages, in mimeograph, which contains a bibliography of the significant articles of permanent value in the fields of history, political and social science, economics, international relations, etc., which relate to affairs, events, and conditions of the period since 1919 and which appear in the principal journals and reviews of the different countries. The *Bulletin* may be subscribed to at 25 francs a year from A. Costes, publisher, 8, rue Monsieur-le-Prince, Paris, VI.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Alfred Stern, *Das Politische Gleichgewicht* (*Archiv für Politik und Geschichte*, January); Cecil Roth, *England and the Last Florentine Republic, 1527-1530* (*English Historical Review*, April); Heinrich Ritter von Srbik, *Der Idcegehalt des "Metternich'schen Systems"* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, CXXXI. 2); Adam Lewak, *Giuseppe Mazzini e l'Emigrazione Polacca* (*Il Risorgimento Italiano*,

October-December); Hans Precht, *Englands Stellung zur Deutschen Einheit, 1848-1850* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXI., Beiheft 3); Ange Morre, *Le Garibaldisme et la France*, I.-concl. (Nouvelle Revue, March 1, 15, April 1, 15, May 1); Walter Platzhoff, *Die Deutsche Aktenpublikation über den Artikel V. des Prager Friedens* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, January); Egone Cesare Corti, *Il Conte Corti al Congresso di Berlino* (Nuova Antologia, April 16); W. A. Gauld, *The Dreikaiserbündnis and the Eastern Question* (English Historical Review, April); W. L. Langer, *The Franco-Russian Alliance, 1890-1894* (Slavonic Review, March); Hans Rothfels, *Das Wesen des Russisch-Französischen Zweibundes* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, February); Manfredi Gravina, *Napoli (1904) e Biörkö (1905); dai Documenti Diplomatici Tedeschi* (Nuova Antologia, May 1); Comte de Sainte-Aulaire, *Souvenirs de mon Ambassade à Londres*, IV. (Revue de Paris, March 15).

### THE WORLD WAR

General review: Pierre Renouvin, *Histoire de la Guerre, 1914-1918* (Revue Historique, May).

The Verband Deutscher Historiker, meeting at Frankfurt a. M. in October last (its first meeting since before the war), voted the following declaration, which we are asked to publish:

"Der deutsche Historikertag erklärt:

"Die Frage nach der schuldhaften Verantwortlichkeit einzelner Völker, Länder, Parteien oder Personen für den Weltkrieg kann wissenschaftlich nur nach Oeffnung der Archive der am Krieg beteiligten Mächte durch gründliche und methodische Quellenforschung entschieden werden.

"Die Beantwortung dieser Frage durch ein Aktenstück von Diplomaten der Siegerstaaten ist eine Ungeheuerlichkeit, die vordem in aller Weltgeschichte noch niemals gewagt worden ist.

"Die erzwungene Unterschrift unter das Schuldbekenntnis des Versailler Friedens (§ 231) ist für die Feststellung der geschichtlichen Wahrheit ohne jede Bedeutung."

John S. Ewart, K. C., a retired barrister of Ottawa, is the author of two volumes on the *Roots and Causes of the War* (New York, George H. Doran Company, pp. 1204), in which the effort is made to analyze the case of each belligerent, with the object of discovering why each entered the war.

An important contribution to the discussion of war responsibility is made in the recollections of Freiherr v. Musulin, the section-chief in the Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs who personally drafted the ultimatum to Serbia. The book is entitled *Das Haus am Ballplatz* (Munich, Verlag für Kulturpolitik, 1924); the author maintains that the Austrian government expected Serbia to accept the ultimatum.

Vol. X. of General Palat's *La Grande Guerre sur le Front Occidental* describes *La Ruée sur Verdun, 5 Août, 1915-30 Juin, 1916* (Paris, Berger, 1925, pp. 484).

Maj.-Gen. Sir Edmund Ironside's *Tannenberg: the First Thirty Days in East Prussia* (London, Blackwood) is by the commandant of the British Staff College, and presents not only narrative but criticisms and deductions.

The experiences of the Italian statesman, Benito Mussolini, as a common soldier in the Great War, are set down in *My Diary, 1915-1917*, which Small, Maynard, and Company have published in a translation by Rita Wellman.

Further additions to the French series in the Carnegie Foundation's *Economic and Social History of the World War* are Arthur Fontaine's *L'Industrie Française pendant la Guerre* (Paris, Presses Universitaires, 1925, pp. xii, 504) and Raoul Blanchard's *Les Forces Hydro-Électriques pendant la Guerre* (*ibid.*, pp. xii, 128).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Hermann Lutz, *Die Schuldfrage in der Oeffentlichen Meinung Englands* (*Archiv für Politik und Geschichte*, March).

#### GREAT BRITAIN

Vol. I. of M. S. Giuseppi's *Guide to the Manuscripts preserved in the Public Record Office* has been already noticed (XXIX. 830). Vol. II. (H. M. Stationery Office, 1924, pp. ix, 261) has now appeared. Scargill-Bird's manual was nearly confined to the records of Chancery, the Exchequer, and other courts. Mr. Giuseppi's first volume was concerned mainly with these papers of judicial courts. The present volume describes the State Papers and records of public departments, and furnishes an inventory or list of their various classes and subdivisions so full as to make it the indispensable handbook of those who resort to the Public Record Office, though students of American history will need also the more detailed manuals which have been provided for their use by American means. The arrangement is by offices contributing, but a good index supplies the need of a subject guide. It will be observed that, with the exception of the Colonial and Foreign Office papers, 1837 is still the limit of search in most classes of the records.

The Oxford University Press announces *Prehistoric and Roman Wales*, by R. E. M. Wheeler; *Revenues of Kings of England, 1066-1399*, by the late Sir James Ramsay, in two volumes; *Prejudice and Promise in the Fifteenth Century*, by C. L. Kingsford, being the Ford Lectures for 1924; and *Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth*, by Dr. Conyers Read of Philadelphia, in three volumes.

The Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge brings out *The History of the London Charterhouse* from its foundation until the suppression of the monastery, by the late Sir William St. John Hope, with plans and many plates.

*Miscellaneous Writings of Henry the Eighth, King of England, France, and Ireland*, edited by Francis Macnamara, includes King Henry's



will, two proclamations, a letter to the Emperor, songs, love letters to Anne Boleyn, etc. (New York, the Chaucer Head, 12 W. 47th Street).

In the publications of the Alcuin Club Professor W. P. M. Kennedy of Toronto, who in 1908, with Dr. W. H. Frere, now bishop of Truro, published three volumes of *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*, now publishes through the same organization three further volumes, extending to the death of Elizabeth, accompanied by a dissertation on Elizabethan Episcopal Administration.

Mr. R. H. Tawney contributes to the series of *Classics of Social and Political Science* an edition of *A Discourse upon Usury* (1572), by Thomas Wilson, with an historical introduction of considerable length and of much value upon the economics of the Elizabethan period.

*Travel in Seventeenth Century England* (Oxford University Press), by Joan Parkes, covers all aspects of the subject both on land and water, with separate chapters on such topics as Roads and Bridges, and the Watch.

*Hobbes und die Staatsphilosophie* receive treatment from an original standpoint at the hands of Richard Höningwald, as vol. XXI. of Gustav Kafka's *Geschichte der Philosophie in Einzeldarstellungen* (Munich, Reinhardt, 1924, pp. 207).

The Royal Historical Society expects to issue soon a second volume in its series of *Diplomatic Instructions* to British ministers abroad, namely, a volume comprising those to the envoys sent to France between 1689 and 1727, edited by Mr. L. G. Wickham Legg. A volume relating to Denmark in the same period, edited by J. F. Chance, will follow.

Professor Webster's important volume on *The Foreign Policy of Castlereagh* (reviewed above, p. 812) is followed closely by Mr. Temperley's companion volume on *The Foreign Policy of George Canning*. It will be reviewed later. In both cases, all accessible materials have been studied, except that, as it appears, neither Lord Londonderry nor Lord Lascelles saw fit to allow examination of the papers of Castlereagh or of Canning, respectively, by scholars who have done more for the fame of these two statesmen than anyone ever did before.

The Oxford University Press has brought out *The History of Aeronautics in Great Britain from the Earliest Times to the latter Half of the Nineteenth Century*, by J. E. Hodgson.

The Scottish History Society has published from the Balcarres Papers in the Advocates' Library at Edinburgh the second and concluding volume, 1548-1557, of *Foreign Correspondence with Marie de Lorraine, Queen of Scotland*, edited by Miss Marguerite Wood, a volume of much interest for the history of the French court of that period as well as for the history of Scotland.

British government publications: *Curia Regis Rolls*, II., 1201-1203; *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, IX., for 1684 (Edinburgh, H. M. General Register House, pp. xxi, 994); *Journal of the Commissioners for Trade and Plantations*, 1709-1715; 1715-1718.

Other documentary publications: *Register of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury*, part II., ed. G. J. Turner and H. E. Salter (British Academy).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Philip Guedalla, *A Father of the Revolution: Portrait of the Amiable Lord North* (Harper's Magazine, May); W. G. H. Cook, *Electoral Reform and Organized Christianity in England*, III. (Political Science Quarterly, March); Brig.-Gen. John H. Morgan, *More Light on Lord Morley* (North American Review, March); Lillian M. Penson, *The Origin of the Crown Agency Office* (English Historical Review, April).

#### IRELAND AND THE DOMINIONS

(For Canada, see p. 911; for India, see p. 896.)

The Belfast Natural History and Philosophical Society has illustrated, largely on the basis of modern excavations, an important portion of the early ecclesiastical history of Ireland by the publication of *The Monastery of St. Mochoi of Nendrum*, by H. C. Lawlor.

A second edition of Professor Hugh E. Egerton's *Federations and Unions within the British Empire* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1924, pp. 306) brings down to June, 1924, the references to conditions and law prevailing in the Dominions. These changes are for the most part presented in a four-page appendix of additions to notes.

Among forthcoming books is a reprint of *The Selborne Memorandum: a Review of the Mutual Relations of the British South African Colonies in 1907* (London, Humphrey Milford), with an introduction by Professor Basil Williams, discussing the origin and authorship of the memorandum.

The late J. A. Rogers's volume for Australasia in the *Historical Geography of the British Dominions* has been brought out in a new edition, in which Mr. R. M. Kershaw, formerly a Rhodes scholar from New South Wales, adds material that brings the story down to and through the World War. The style is more sober than that of Mr. Rogers, and the information abundant.

#### FRANCE

A consortium of French historical societies and scholars has been formed under the designation Comité Français des Sciences Historiques. It is composed of representatives of the Institute, of the more important historical societies, of the universities, and of the various special fields of

historical study. Its chairman is M. Théophile Homolle, its secretary, M. Michel Lhéritier (5, rue du Printemps, Paris XVII.), other members being MM. Glotz, F. Lot, Pagès, Guignebert, André, Dupont, Ferrier, Alphandéry, Léon Cahen, and Mirot. The object of the committee is to serve as a central agency for the grouping and co-ordination of historical interests in France and to represent French historians in international relations, and particularly in the organization of the International Committee of Historical Sciences.

Studies on the military institutions of the French monarchy, particularly in the seventeenth century, are rare. An excellent doctoral thesis by Lieut. A. Navereau fills this gap on one phase of the subject, *Le Logement et les Ustensiles des Gens de Guerre de 1430 à 1780* (Poitiers, Société Française d'Imprimerie, 1924, pp. ix, 232); a bibliography accompanies the text.

Under the title, *La Vie Économique et les Classes Sociales en France au XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris, Alcan, 1924, pp. 231), Henri Sée has brought together eight essays, four on agriculture, four on capitalism and social classes.

The most recent of Professor Aulard's contributions to Revolutionary history is *Le Christianisme et la Révolution Française* (Paris, Rieder, 1925, pp. 160).

The April number of the Howard College (Ala.) *Bulletin* (*Howard College Studies*) consists of a Critical Bibliography of the Pamphlet Literature published in France between July 5 and Dec. 27, 1788, by Mitchell B. Garrett.

Many who think of General Miranda in connection with Venezuelan independence are not familiar with the side of his life set forth in *Miranda et la Révolution Française* by Parra Perez (Paris, Roger, 1925, pp. lxiv, 374).

Professor Albert Mathiez pursues his work of rehabilitation in a dozen critical essays, grouped together in a volume called *Autour de Robespierre* (Paris, Payot, 1925).

The first number for 1925 of the *Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises* has an article by M. Paul Roussier on the origin of the Dépôt des Papiers Publics des Colonies, especially concerning the dépôt at Rochefort and of interest to American readers because of the connection of its foundation with the retirement of French officials from Louisbourg and from Canada; also the first installment of an account of the establishment of the French in Upper Senegal, 1817-1822, by M. Paul Marty.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. L. Ganshof, *Notes Critiques sur Eginhard* (*Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, October-December, 1924); Gerh. Ehrenforth, *Hinkmar von Rheims und Ludwig III. von Westfranken* (*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 1925, 1); Salomon

Reinach, *Observations sur le Texte du Procès de Condamnation de Jeanne d'Arc* (Revue Historique, March); Léon Maitre, *À Quels Usages ont Servi les Domaines de la Couronne en Bretagne* (Annales de Bretagne, XXXVI. 2-3); J. de la Martinière, *Le Parlement sous les Rois de France* (*ibid.*); André de Maricourt, *L'Armée de Condé* (Revue des Questions Historiques, April); Philip Guedalla, *Portrait of Louis XVI.: a Monarch who aided America—and Why* (Harper's Magazine, April); Ph. Sagnac, *L'Avènement de Bonaparte à l'Empire; le Consulat à Vie* (Napoléon, March); G. Hanotaux, *Du Consulat à l'Empire*, I., II. (Revue des Deux Mondes, March 1, 15); Duc de Broglie, *Mémoires*, III.-VI. (*ibid.*, January 15, February 1, March 1, 15); G. Goyau, *Le Cardinal Lavigerie*, I.-IV. (*ibid.*, March 15, April 1, 15, May 1); *id.*, *Un Historien de la France Politique*, M. Louis Madelin (*ibid.*, January 15).

#### ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

General reviews: Friedrich Schneider, *Neuere Dante-Literatur*, IV. (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXI. 3); Luis Araujo-Costa, *Courrier Espagnol* (Revue des Questions Historiques, April).

A short, somewhat dry, but clear and solid *Kurzgefasste Geschichte Italiens von Romulus bis Viktor Emmanuel* (Gotha, Perthes, 1924, pp. vii, 342), by the late Ludo M. Hartmann, for many years occupied with Italian history, unites much scattered material in compact form.

*Il Regno di Sicilia negli Ultimi Anni di Vita di Carlo II. d'Angiò* (Naples, Albrighi, 1924, pp. 194), by A. Cutolo, though limited to fourteen years of this reign, is an excellent contribution to the phase of Sicilian history which it records.

Professor Giovanni Soranzo, in *La Lega Italiana, 1454-1455* (Milan, *Vita e Pensiero*), not only gives the history of the league then formed by Pope Nicholas V., Milan, Venice, and Florence, but makes an interesting and suggestive comparison, *magnis componere parva*, with the League of Nations.

In a centenary publication, *La Cassa di Risparmio delle Provincie Lombarde nella Evoluzione Economica della Regione* (Milan, Cassa di Risparmio) two studies of much importance appear, one by R. Ciasca on the economic evolution of Lombardy from 1800 to 1860, the other by G. Luzzatto following the same theme from 1860 to 1922.

Vol. V. of the *Pubblicazioni* of the Piedmontese section of the Società per la Storia del Risorgimento Italiano, entitled *Dalle Riforme allo Statuto di Carlo Alberto*, ed. Adolfo Colombo, contains the minutes of the conferences that led to Charles Albert's adoption of a constitutional régime in 1848, with illustrative documents and commentary; see also Paolo Negri in *Il Risorgimento Italiano*, October-December, pp. 781-822.

Among the principal articles in the *Archivio Storico per la Sicilia Orientale*, vol. XIX., fasc. 3 (Catania, 1924), are C. Naselli, "Dieci Lettere

Inedite di Tommaso Gargallo a Giuseppe Gioeni"; P. Lajallo, "L'Editto di Bisanzio del 725, Trattamento della Sicilia durante la Persecuzione Iconoclasta"; V. Finocchiaro, "Catania e il Risorgimento Politico Nazionale nelle Memorie Inedite di Carlo Gemmellaro"; P. Orsi, "Bibliografia Siciliana Archeologica, Numismatica, Artistica e Storica per il 1922 e 1923".

The Madrid house called Editorial Arte y Ciencia has projected the issue of the *Obras Completas* of Professor Rafael Altamira, in more than fifty volumes, of which the "Serie Histórica" and the "Serie Americana" especially interest the readers of this journal. The former will include his *Historia de España* in nine or ten volumes, the latter an *Historia de América*, a new work in fifteen or sixteen volumes yet to be brought out.

Professor R. B. Merriman is about to send to the press the manuscript of his work on Charles V. continuing his *Rise of the Spanish Empire*.

Vol. II. of Commandant A. Grasset's *La Guerre d'Espagne, 1807-1813*, treats of *Le Soulèvement d'Espagne; Cordoue, Valence, la Haute Espagne* (Paris, Berger, 1925, pp. viii, 360).

In a volume entitled *O Desejado* (Lisbon, Aillaud) Senhor Antonio Sergio has brought together seven contemporary accounts of the romantic and tragic expedition of 1578 which brought King Sebastian of Portugal to his death and his kingdom to its downfall.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Arrigo Solmi, *La Scuola di Pavia nell' Alto Medio Evo* (Nuova Antologia, May 1); G. Bertoni, *Ippolito d'Este, Cardinale di Ferrara* (Rivista Storica Italiana, October); Giustino Fortunato, *Le Ultime Ore di Gioacchino Murat* (Nuova Antologia, May 1); Ilario Rinieri, *Le Cospirazioni Mazziniane nel Carteggio di un Transfuga* [Michele Accursi, spy, Vatican Archives] (Il Risorgimento Italiano, 1924, 1925); Ernest d'Hauterive, *La Mission du Prince Napoléon en Italie, 1866: Lettres Inédites* (Revue des Deux Mondes, May 1).

#### GERMANY, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND, CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The last available issue of the *Historische Vierteljahrschrift* (XXII. 2, 3) continues Dr. Friedrich Busch's classified *Bibliographie zur Deutschen Geschichte*, of which it contains nearly two thousand titles of books and articles, published during the last five years.

The house of Otto Harrassowitz announces a reprinting of the folio volumes of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, namely, "Scriptores I.-XXX.", "Leges I.-V.", and "Diplomata I.", individual volumes of which can be obtained at M. 240, unbound, if subscribed for at once.

The story of German colonization in adjacent Slavic lands is well told by Dietrich Schäfer in *Osteuropa und Wir Deutschen* (Berlin, Elsner, 1924, pp. 191).

Among recent works on various phases of German history are J. Buhler, *Die Sächsischen und Salischen Kaiser, nach Zeitgenössischen Quellen* (Leipzig, Insel-Verlag, 1924); G. B. Volz, ed., *Friedrich der Grosse und Wilhelmine von Bayreuth*, Band I., *Jugendbriefe* (Leipzig, Koehler, 1925); B. Grundmann, *Der Gegenwärtige Stand der Historischen Kritik an Bismarcks "Gedanken und Erinnerungen"*, Band I. (Berlin, Ebering, 1925).

The archivist of Bamberg, H. Burkard, has edited the handsome *Festschrift zum 900. Todestage Kaiser Heinrichs des Zweiten* (Heimatblätter des Historischen Vereins Bamberg 1924, 4. Jahrgang, Bamberg, Buchner), containing eighteen essays on various aspects of this reign, artistic and literary as well as historical.

A learned and interesting study of German inns and innkeepers, from the earliest times to the seventeenth century, by Fräulein Johanna Kachel, *Herberge und Gastwirtschaft in Deutschland bis zum 17. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, W. Kohlhammer), is published as a supplement to the *Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*.

The hitherto untold story of the Protestant cathedral foundations of north Germany, from the Reformation to 1918, is set forth on the basis of archival material in *Die Evangelischen Dom- und Kollegiatstifter Preussens insbesondere Brandenburg, Merseburg, Naumburg, Zeitz*, by Dr. Johannes Heckel (Stuttgart, Enke, 1924, pp. xii, 455).

A valuable contribution to the history of Romanticism is found in *Geistesleben und Politik in Schleswig-Holstein um die Wende des 18. Jahrhunderts* by Otto Brandt (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1925, pp. xv, 448).

The ninth volume of Varnhagen von Ense's *Denkwürdigkeiten des Eigenen Lebens*, which covers *Die Karlsruher Jahre 1816-1819*, during which he was Prussian minister to Baden (a source used by Treitschke), has received a new edition by Hermann Haering (Karlsruhe, Müller, 1924, pp. xix, 378).

Five historical and political addresses by Professor Erich Marcks of Berlin are collected under the title *Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1925, pp. 172); their subjects are respectively, "England und Frankreich während der Letzten Jahrhunderte"; "Napoleon und Alexander I."; "Tiefpunkte des Deutschen Schicksals in der Neuzeit"; "Preussen als Gebilde der Auswärtigen Politik"; "Pfingstpredigt, 1925".

*Fra Krigstiden: Dagbogsoptegnelser* (Copenhagen, Gyldendal, two vols.), by H. P. Hanssen, the chief leader of the Danish party in the German Reichstag, has great value as a record of the war-time doings of that body, from the point of view of an unfriendly minority.

Dr. Rudolf Wackernagel, for many years archivist of Basel, has produced a volume on *Humanismus und Reformation in Basel* (Basel, Helbing and Lichtenhahn, 1924, pp. xii, 524, 119, Bd. III. of *Geschichte der Stadt Basel*) which we have seen praised by competent authority as the best history, for that period, of any large German city.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Carl Stephenson, *La Taille dans les Villes d'Allemagne* (Le Moyen Age, January-April, 1924-1925); W. Stolze, *Der Charakter des Deutschen Bauernkrieges von 1525* (Preussische Jahrbücher, April); Hans Roeseler, *Die Deutsche Auswärtige Politik seit 1871* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, February); E. Schwartz, *Bismarck als Prophet* (ibid., March); Ed. von Wertheimer, *Kronprinz Erzherzog Rudolf und Fürst Bismarck* (ibid., April); B. Schwertfeger, *Die Vierte Reihe der Diplomatischen Akten des Auswärtigen Amtes* (ibid., February); E. Beneš and R. W. Seton-Watson, *President Masaryk in Exile* (Slavonic Review, March).

#### NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

In arranging for an exhibit of manuscripts in the library of the Union Theological Seminary, on occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the American Historical Association (New York, 1909), Professor William W. Rockwell unearthed from among the manuscripts of Leander van Ess a twelfth-century *Liber Miraculorum Ninivensium Sancti Cornelii Papae*, of which he has now printed the Latin text in a monograph of 130 pp., otherwise written in German (New York, Stechert). The Premonstratensian abbey of Ninove, some twenty-five miles southeast of Ghent, had relics of St. Cornelius. The manuscript is the fundamental source for the early history of the monastery, which Professor Rockwell sets forth in his learned commentary.

In *Documents relatifs au Grand Schisme*, vol. I., *Suppliques de Clément VIII., 1378-1379* (Paris, Champion, 1924, pp. 692), being vol. VIII. of the *Analecta Vaticano-Belgica*, Professor Karl Hanquet of the University of Liège publishes 2513 documents from nine Vatican registers, indicative of the confused conditions in the dioceses of Cambrai, Liège, Thérouanne, and Tournai during that troubled period.

#### NORTHERN EUROPE AND RUSSIA

The Norwegian *Historisk Tidsskrift*, 1924, no. 4, contains a full bibliography of Norwegian history for 1923-830 items.

In commemoration of the sixtieth birthday of the Swedish historian Professor Ludwig Stavenow of Upsala, pupils and friends have co-operated in producing a volume of sixteen *Historiska Studier* (Stockholm, P. A. Norstedt and Sons, pp. 338), among which we especially note one of much value by Professor E. F. Heckscher on the economic policy of Gustavus Vasa and his sons, and one by Gottfrid Carlsson on the steps that led to the election of Eric of Pomerania as Swedish king in 1396.



A new enterprise of scientific importance is the *Jahresberichte für Kultur und Geschichte der Slaven*, edited by Erdmann Hanisch, of which the first volume has just appeared (Breslau, Priebatsch, 1924, pp. vi, 229). It contains bibliographical notes of value; among publications of special interest to the historian, attention is directed to Bertold Bretholtz, *Uebersicht über die Literatur zur Böhmischo-Mährischen Kolonisation*; Richard Salomon, *Neue Russische Memoirenliteratur*; Friedrich Andreae, *Neuere Deutsche Darstellungen Russischer Geschichte*; id., *Das Bolschewistische Russland in der Deutschen Publizistischen Literatur*.

A valuable and partly bibliographical survey of Slavonic Studies in America, by Professor Robert J. Kerner, is printed in the December number of the *Slavonic Review*.

The third volume of K. Waliszewski's *La Russie il y a Cent Ans: Le Règne d'Alexandre Ier* has just appeared; it embraces the years 1818-1825 (Paris, Plon, 1925).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: N. Brian-Chaninov, *Les Origines de la Russie Historique*, II. (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, April); Sir Bernard Pares, *Sir George Buchanan in Russia* (*Slavonic Review*, March); Michael Smilg-Benario, *Die Abdankung des Zaren*, concl. (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, February).

#### SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

A welcome addition to our knowledge of the economic history of the Byzantine Empire is presented by Ch. M. Macri in *L'Organisation de l'Économie Urbaine dans Byzance sous la Dynastie de Macédoine, 867-1057* (Paris, Guillon, 1925).

*Le Règne d'Othon, la Grande Idée, 1830-1862* (Paris, Presses Universitaires, 1925, pp. xv, 498), furnishes the subject-matter of vol. II. of the *Histoire Diplomatique de la Grèce de 1821 à Nos Jours* by Édouard Driault and Michel Lhéritier. M. Lhéritier also has an article in the March *Revue Historique* on the beginning of the Danish dynasty, 1862-1863.

#### ASIA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

The late Francis J. Monahan (d. 1923), for many years a valued magistrate in India, was long occupied with the history of Bengal, of which the completed portion is now printed under the title, *The Early History of Bengal* (Oxford University Press, pp. 248). It is confined to the Maurya period, deals partly with Bihar as well as with Bengal, and, after such narrative chapters as are possible, occupies itself mainly with Maurya institutions, this portion being based mainly on the Arthaśāstra, but partly on the Greek sources.

From the house of Macmillan comes *A History of the Church of England in India since the Early Days of the East India Company*, by the Rev. Dr. Eyre Chatterton, bishop of Nagpur.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Sir Aurel Stein, *Innermost Asia: its Geography as a Factor in History* (Geographical Journal, May); Adm. G. A. Ballard, *Albuquerque's Operations on the Western Seaboard of India* (Mariner's Mirror, April).

#### AFRICA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

An important publication of the Société de Géographie d'Égypte is *L'Angleterre et l'Expédition Française en Égypte* by François Charles-Roux (Paris, Champion, 1925, 2 vols., pp. 278, 374).

#### AMERICA

##### GENERAL ITEMS

The Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington has in the printer's hands its *Guide to British West Indian Archive Materials for American History*, prepared by Professor Herbert C. Bell, David W. Parker, and others. Of the members of the staff, Miss Davenport sailed for London in June, for further work on her second volume of *Treaties*.

Among recent accessions in the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress are papers of Philip R. Fendall, 1806-1869, of Charles Butler of New York, 1819-1883, of Senators William P. Fessenden of Maine, 1832-1869, and Thomas Ewing of Ohio, 1820-1832, and of Charlotte Cushman, 1839-1876; the journals of the late Alvey A. Adee; fourteen volumes of records of the Confederate State Department, and about 1500 pages of transcripts of documents from the Danish archives relating to the Danish West Indies, 1653-1787.

*A Political and Social History of the United States* (Macmillan), prepared for college use, consists of two volumes, the first by Professor Homer C. Hockett of the Ohio State University, running from 1492 to 1828, the second by Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger of Harvard University, from 1828 to the present time. The American Book Company has brought out a *History of America*, by Professor Carl R. Fish; Messrs. Longmans a *History of Commerce of the United States*, by Professor Clive Day.

The Carnegie Institution of Washington has published, as one of the contributions to American economic history prepared by its former Department of Economics and Sociology, *A History of Agriculture in the Northern United States, 1620-1860* (pp. xii, 512), by Dr. Percy W. Bidwell, economist of the U. S. Tariff Commission, and Professor John I. Falconer of the Ohio State University.

Many historical students will find use for the government publication entitled *Constitution of the United States as Amended to Dec. 1, 1924. Annotated* (68 Cong., 1 sess., Sen. doc. 154, pp. lii, 876), an edition provided with citations to cases in the Supreme Court construing the several

provisions of the Constitution. It can be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, at the Government Printing Office, for \$2.50. He will also supply, gratuitously, *Price List 50*, eleventh edition, being a list of government publications in American history and biography which he has for sale.

*Executive Influence in Determining Military Policy in the United States*, by Professor Howard White of the Ohio Wesleyan University, appears as vol. XII., nos. 1 and 2 (March, June, 1924), of the *University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences*. Professor White first examines those provisions of the Constitution which affect the power to determine military policy, both as between Congress and the states and as between Congress and the executive. Because of its formative and precedent-fixing character, the period of Washington's administration has been especially examined, 83 pages being devoted to this period as against 125 to that since 1797. Executive influence has varied; its weight has seemed to run in cycles, depending upon whether the time was a time of peace, impending war, actual war, or a return to conditions of peace.

*The History of the United States Marine Corps* which Major Edwin N. McClellan, U. S. M. C., officer in charge of the Historical Section of that corps, has for some years been preparing, has advanced so far that several chapters have been put forth in a mimeographed first edition.

The Marine Research Society, Salem, Mass., has brought out a volume entitled *The Sea, the Ship, and the Sailor: Tales of Adventure from Log Books and Original Narratives*, with an introduction by Capt. Elliot Snow. There are five of these narratives, of the period 1770-1832, none of which have been hitherto printed. The volume is illustrated with reproductions of rare engravings and photographs.

The March number of the *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia opens with the presidential address, on the Mission of the Catholic Historian, delivered before the society last December, by Professor Peter Guilday. It also contains an account of Anti-Catholic Parties in American Politics, by Rev. Dr. Paul J. Foik, C.S.C., and an interesting history of the Trappists of Monks Mound (Cahokia, 1809-1813) and Dom Urban Guillet, by Rev. G. J. Garraghan, S. J.

An historical survey of the religion and religious institutions of the Jewish people in the United States, with the title *American Judaism*, from the pen of Joseph Leiser, is brought out by the Bloch Publishing Company.

#### ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

The Cortes Society of New York has issued no. 3 of its publications (nos. 1, 2, 4, and 5 already published), being *An Account of the Conquest of Guatemala in 1524*, by Pedro de Alvarado, edited with translation by Sedley J. Mackie, with a facsimile of the Spanish original of 1525.

The Harvard University Press will publish this autumn two volumes on *The Life and Work of Increase Mather*, by Dr. Kenneth B. Murdock, who has already prepared a privately printed monograph on the portraits of Mather.

The Council of the Mount Vernon Ladies Association has completed plans for the publication of all known and available diaries of General Washington, beginning with that of 1748 and covering the rest of his life to 1799, with few interruptions.

Mr. Paul L. Haworth has written an account of the home life and agricultural activities of Washington, to which is given the title *George Washington, Country Gentleman* (Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill). The book is understood to be a revision of the author's work published some ten years ago under the title *George Washington, Farmer*.

The Oxford University Press announces a volume on *The Quebec Act: a Study in Statesmanship*, by R. Coupland, professor of colonial history at Oxford.

The celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of April 19, 1775, brings out *The Day of Concord and Lexington* (Boston, Little, Brown, and Company, pp. 295), carefully studied by Allen French of Concord. The Houghton Mifflin Company have published, on occasion of the celebrations occurring this spring, a cheaper edition of Mr. Harold Murdock's *The Nineteenth of April, 1775*, and a volume of very interesting *Letters on the American Revolution, 1774-1776*, collected from British newspapers of the time by Margaret Wheeler Willard (Mrs. James F. Willard).

The New York Historical Society announces the publication, conditioned upon a sufficient number of advance orders, of a volume entitled *Uniforms of the American, British, French, and Hessian Armies in the War of the American Revolution, 1775-1783*, painted and described by the late Charles M. Lefferts. As proposed, the book is to be of about 250 large pages, to contain fifty pictures in forty colored plates with descriptive text, and, in addition, descriptions of hundreds of uniforms worn by the militia and levies of the various states as well as of the Continental Line.

Professor Norman S. Buck has brought out through the Yale University Press a volume entitled *The Development of the Organization of Anglo-American Trade, 1800-1850*.

*A History of the First United States Mint, its People and its Operations*, by Frank H. Stewart, has been published in Philadelphia by William J. Campbell (223 South Sydenham Street).

Professor Julius W. Pratt is the author of a volume entitled *Expansionists of 1812*, which Macmillan has published.

Professor Everett S. Brown of the University of Michigan is preparing for publication the letters of William Plumer, jr., of New Hampshire, relating to the Missouri Compromises and the political situation with respect to the presidency, 1819-1825. The book is to be issued by the Missouri Historical Society.

The biography entitled *Washington Irving, Esquire*, by George S. Hellman (New York, Alfred Knopf) adds much to previous knowledge in respect to Irving's relations to Van Buren and other Democratic politicians and in respect to his diplomatic service in Europe.

Houghton Mifflin Company has brought out a volume by William H. Townsend entitled *Lincoln the Litigant*, a companion volume to the author's *Abraham Lincoln, Defendant*. Rev. Dr. William E. Barton furnishes an introduction.

The Macmillan Company has brought out the sixth volume of Professor Edward Channing's *History of the United States*, extending from 1850 to 1865, with the subtitle "The War for Southern Independence".

The Essex Institute expects to publish soon a volume by F. B. C. Bradlee on *Blockade Running during the Civil War, and the Effect of Land and Water Transportation on the Confederacy*.

An historical narrative of a trapper, frontiersman, scout, and guide of great fame in his day is *James Bridger* (Salt Lake City, Shephard Book Company), by J. Cecil Alter and the late Maj.-Gen. Grenville M. Dodge; Harcourt, Brace, and Company have lately brought out a biography of *Brigham Young* by M. R. Werner, author of the biography of P. T. Barnum that appeared in 1923.

Two brief biographical volumes of a recently deceased statesman are presented in *Henry Cabot Lodge* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, pp. 204), by Bishop William Lawrence of Massachusetts, and *Henry Cabot Lodge, the Statesman* (Boston, Small, Maynard, and Company, pp. 152), by Charles S. Groves, formerly secretary of the Republican state committee of Massachusetts and for eleven years Washington correspondent of one of the Boston newspapers.

The memorial address, *Woodrow Wilson*, delivered before Congress December 15, 1924, by President Edwin A. Alderman of the University of Virginia, has been published by Doubleday, Page, and Company.

The June number of *The World's Work* contains an opening installment, September, 1913-May, 1914, of hitherto unpublished letters from Walter H. Page in London to President Wilson, edited by Burton J. Hendrick, and destined to appear later in a third volume of the *Life and Letters of Walter H. Page*.

The firm of Dutton has brought out an autobiography of the late Samuel Gompers, entitled *Seventy Years of Life and Labor*.

*Commanding an American Army* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company) is the narrative of Maj.-Gen. Hunter Liggett, who commanded the First Army in France.

LOCAL ITEMS ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

NEW ENGLAND

The Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities expects shortly to have in Boston a central museum of importance, adequate for the housing of its remarkable collections of furniture, architectural detail, colonial textiles, utensils, farm implements from early times, documents, photographs of old houses, and the like. Having acquired the Harrison Gray Otis house on Cambridge Street, Boston, it expects to remodel it, together with two adjacent houses, to suit the requirements of a museum.

A severely critical and distinctly iconoclastic monograph on *Das Puritanische Neu-England* has been written by Georg Friederici as the first number of *Studien über Amerika und Spanien*, edited by Karl Sapper, Arthur Franz, and Adalbert Hämel (Halle, Niemeyer, 1924, pp. 104).

The state of Vermont will before long print the *Journals* of its general assembly from 1778 to 1786.

The Massachusetts Historical Society has issued the sixth volume of its reprint of the *Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts* (pp. xvii, 488), covering four sessions of two legislatures, May 27, 1724-January 17, 1726, and, like its predecessors, full of data for Massachusetts history. The war against the eastern Indians still continued, but a rule of the House against printing votes on the subject reduces the amount of matter concerning it. A resolution was passed for censuring any member that should disclose debates or secrets of the House, and one member was expelled for such conduct. On January 15, 1726, we for the first time see the yeas and nays recorded. The original edition of these *Journals* seems to have been about two hundred. The December serial of the *Proceedings* of the society is mainly occupied with fresh documents on Thomas Morton of Merrymount, presented by Col. C. E. Banks. They increase our knowledge of Morton without heightening his reputation.

The Saint Catherine Press, Stamford Street, London, S. E., is bringing out *The Loyalists of Massachusetts: their Memorials, Petitions, and Claims*, by E. Alfred Jones, F. R. Hist. S. As originally planned the work was to have included the complete texts of the documents, which would have run to about six volumes; but owing to the high cost of printing Mr. Jones has been obliged to content himself with a limited number of full texts and a summary of others. The papers deal with some 475 Loyalists, are in the main autobiographical, and throw interesting light upon public events in the early stages of the Revolution.

*A History of Bristol County, Massachusetts*, in three volumes, by Frank W. Hutt, is put forth by the Lewis Historical Publishing Company.

The Rhode Island Historical Society has acquired an important collection of Woonsocket newspapers, over fifty volumes in extent, and a photostat of a deed in the handwriting of Roger Williams, 1675. The Society of Colonial Dames in Rhode Island has published an historical map of the state which is distributed by the Rhode Island Historical Society to the children who visit the library as a part of their school work.

*Maritime Connecticut during the American Revolution, 1775-1783*, in two volumes, by Louis F. Middlebrook, is a collection of records, exploits, etc., of more than three hundred state and privateer vessels commissioned by Governor Jonathan Trumbull for service during the Revolution (Salem, Essex Institute).

#### MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The *Quarterly Journal* of the New York State Historical Association has in the April number a paper by Dr. James H. Coyne of Ontario on the activities of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada; one by Peter A. Porter on Old Fort Niagara; and an account of Suffern's Tavern, by George A. Blauvelt, being an address delivered at the unveiling of a tablet on the site of the tavern, in October of last year.

Mr. Horace A. Moses, a native of Ticonderoga, N. Y., has provided a fund of \$100,000 for the building and maintenance of an historical museum at Ticonderoga, which shall house the collections of the New York State Historical Association and provide for the association a permanent headquarters. The building will be substantially a reproduction of the historic John Hancock house at Boston.

Mr. Henry G. Bayer, lecturer in New York University, has produced a volume bearing the title *The Belgians First Settlers in New York and the Middle States; with a Review of the Events which led to their Immigration* (New York, Devin-Adair).

*Washington Heights, Manhattan—its Eventful Past: a Contribution to the History of America*, by Reginald P. Bolton, is offered by the author (116 East Nineteenth Street, New York City).

From the Lewis Historical Publishing Company come *Syracuse and its Environs: a History, Historical and Biographical*, in three volumes, by Franklin H. Chase, and *Troy and Rensselaer County, New York: a History*, also in three volumes, by Rutherford Hayner.

*The Founders and the Founding of Walton, New York*, by Arthur W. North, bears the imprint of the Walton Reporter Company.

Among the contents of the April number of the *Proceedings* of the New Jersey Historical Society are: a catalogue of portraits in possession of the society, by Miss Maud E. Johnson; New Jersey's Tea Party, by



Maj. W. I. Lincoln Adams; a letter to Gen. William Maxwell from Timothy Ford, Sept. 21, 1793; and one from General Maxwell to Blair McClenachan, Aug. 22, 1794.

*The Municipalities of Essex County, New Jersey, 1666-1924*, in four volumes, edited by J. F. Folsom and others, and *South Jersey: a History, 1664-1924*, in four volumes, edited by Alfred M. Heston, are from the Lewis Historical Publishing Company.

William H. Benedict is the author and publisher of *New Brunswick in History* (New Brunswick, N. J., 86 Carroll Place).

The leading title among the contents of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* for April is "A Rare Dutch Document concerning the Province of Pennsylvania in the Seventeenth Century", meaning a pamphlet by Robert Webb, of which only a Dutch translation (Amsterdam, 1686) is known to exist, and only two copies of that; Dr. Daniel B. Sumway gives an English translation and an appropriate introduction concerning the pamphlet and its author. In this number are also two articles: Random Recollections of "Hans Breitmann", by Edward Robbins, and the Parentage of Major John Fenwick, Founder of Salem, New Jersey, by Edwin J. Sellers. With this issue comes also, as a detached supplement, an account, by Randolph G. Adams of the William L. Clements Library, of a Variant Title to William Penn's *Frame of Government*.

Of the *Papers* read before the Lancaster County Historical Society those of March 6 are: Lancaster County History in the several series of the *Pennsylvania Archives* and other Provincial and State Source Books, by H. Frank Eshleman, and James Amesley's (Lord Altamont's) Traditional Residence in Lancaster County, from 1728 to 1741, by the same writer; that of April 3 is the Invasion of Pennsylvania by the Confederates under General Robert E. Lee, and its Effect upon Lancaster and York Counties, by George R. Prowell.

*The Evolution of an American Patriot: being an Intimate Study of the Patriotic Activities of John Henry Miller, German Printer, of the American Revolution*, which appeared in vol. XXXII. of the *Proceedings* of the Pennsylvania-German Society, has been issued as a separate (Lancaster, the Lancaster Press).

The April number of the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* includes an historical address by Dr. George P. Donehoo at the dedication in December of the Washington Crossing Bridge at Pittsburgh; a biographical sketch, by Robert M. Ewing, of Walter Forward (1786-1852), M. C. 1822-1825, secretary of the treasury 1841-1843, and chargé d'affaires to Denmark 1849-1851; and a paper by C. C. Johnson entitled Albert Gallatin of Western Pennsylvania.

## SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

Vol. XLIII. of the *Archives of Maryland* is the *Journal and Correspondence of the State Council of Maryland, 1779-1780*. This is the fifth volume of the sub-series and takes up the journal and correspondence of the council at the point (Oct. 27, 1779) where its predecessor (vol. XXI. of the *Archives*) left off. This volume, as others in the series of *Archives* beginning with vol. XXXVI., has been edited by Dr. Bernard C. Steiner, and in his usual careful manner. The letters addressed to the council are not interspersed chronologically with the journal entries and letters from the council, as hitherto, but have been segregated in a section following the other matter, and sometimes compressed. The index seems more adequate than the indexes to previous volumes.

The March number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* contains, besides continued series hitherto mentioned, a character study, by W. Irvine Cross, of John K. Cowen, prominent attorney of Baltimore and sometime receiver for the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad.

The April number of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* contains the first installment of an interesting study by Mr. Fairfax Harrison, the Proprietors of the Northern Neck: Chapters of Culpeper Genealogy, accompanied by a key chart of the pedigree of the Wigsell Culpepers to illustrate their relations with Virginia. Elizabeth Washington of Hayfield, by William B. McGroarty, is an investigation into the personality of one of the beneficiaries of Washington's will. The *Magazine* begins in this number the publication of a *Diary of John Early (1786-1873)*, noted Methodist minister, a principal founder of Randolph-Macon College, and made bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church South in 1854. The *Diary* pertains to the years 1807-1814, when he was engaged in the itinerant ministry.

The *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* offers in the April number an interesting and valuable body of materials, with Thomas Jefferson as the central figure. There is a group of letters from Rev. James Madison, president of the College of William and Mary, to Jefferson, principally written in the 1780's; two letters to Jefferson relative to the Virginia capitol, written in 1785 by the directors of that enterprise; an especially interesting letter to him from John Daly Burk, the historian of Virginia, written in 1801; one from L. H. Girardin, Burk's successor, to William Wirt in 1815; and a letter from William Herries to Jefferson, dated at St. Louis, Louisiana, November 3, 1804. Finally, there are three letters from John Tennent to Sir Hans Sloane, written in London in 1737 and 1740.

The April number of *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* includes some letters (1842-1856) of Tyler, Calhoun, Polk, Donelson, Houston, Murphy, and Upshur, with some introductory remarks by the editor; a continuation of the letter of Francis W. Gilmer to

Thomas W. Gilmer; some wills of Armistead and Tyler in York County; and a continuation of the genealogical account of the Jefferson family.

*In Tidewater Virginia*, by Dora C. Jett, describes old Virginia homes on the Rappahannock River (Richmond, Whittet and Shepperson).

*A History of Caroline County, Virginia*, by Rev. Marshall Wingfield, is published in Newport News by the author (133 31st Street).

*Jefferson and Monticello*, by Paul Wiltach, is principally a history of Monticello, but treats also in a measure the life of Jefferson.

The North Carolina Historical Commission has brought out a *Handbook of County Records* (pp. 45), prepared by D. L. Corbitt, descriptive of those county records that have been deposited with the commission. There are now 51 such counties, including one (Bute) which was abolished in 1778.

Dr. W. W. Pierson, acting as agent of the North Carolina Historical Commission, has located in the Archives of the Indies at Seville and in the Archivo General at Simancas a large amount of manuscript material bearing on the westward expansion of North Carolina and its relation to Spain. These documents are being copied and arranged for future publication.

John H. Wheeler's *Historical Sketches of North Carolina*, originally published in 1851, and long out of print, is being reprinted by Frederick H. Hitchcock of New York, in a facsimile edition, at the instance of the Daughters of the American Revolution in North Carolina.

*Quaker Contributions to Education in North Carolina*, by Zora Klain, is published in Philadelphia by the Westbrook Publishing Company.

The Historical Commission of South Carolina has brought out the *Journal of the House of Representatives* of that state from Jan. 8 to Feb. 26, 1782 (pp. 143), edited by A. S. Salley, jr., secretary of the commission.

The *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* continues in the numbers for October, 1924, and January, 1925, the Letters of William Smith, Minister to Portugal, and also the Marriage and Death Notices from the *City Gazette*, furnished by Jennie H. Register. Miss Mabel L. Webber contributes to the October number some notes concerning the Berringer family, and also a Presentment of the Grand Jury, March, 1733/34. The January number includes, further, the Journal of Robert Pringle, 1746-1747, edited by Miss Webber; a paper on the Spanish Settlement at Port Royal, 1565-1586, by A. S. Salley, jr.; and a letter from Dr. William Charles Wells (1757-1817) to Dr. James Currie, written from Charleston in the spring of 1781.

The *Transactions*, no. 29, of the Huguenot Society of South Carolina contains an address, by Brig.-Gen. Eli K. Cole of the United States Marine Corps, on Charles Fort, South Carolina, built by Ribault in 1562, and a number of wills of South Carolina Huguenots.

A *History of the Pee Dee Baptist Association* (pp. 232), by William C. Allen, is published at Dillon, S. C., by the association.

The Florida State Historical Society has in press the second volume of Miss Brevard's *History of Florida* (see above, p. 868), the first volume of Mrs. Connor's *Colonial Records of Spanish Florida*, Professor Priestley's edition of *Tristan de Luna's Expedition to West Florida in 1558*, and Professor J. O. Knauss's *Territorial Newspapers of Florida*. Besides volumes heretofore mentioned, Mrs. Connor will edit a facsimile edition of Ribault's *Whole and True Discoverie*, of which only two copies are known.

The April number of the *Florida Historical Society Quarterly* contains a brief paper concerning the agitation for the removal of the capital of Florida; the second of the papers on Jacksonville and the Seminole War, 1835-1836; a study of Education in Florida, 1821-1829, by Dr. J. O. Knauss; and the text of George III.'s proclamation on the acquisition of East and West Florida.

Mr. Henry P. Dart contributes to the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, January number, 1924 ("published February, 1925"), the documents in a Case in Admiralty in Louisiana in 1741, together with an appropriate introduction. The documents (which are not without interesting personal elements) are given both in the original French and in English translation. Other contributions to this number of the *Quarterly* are: Documents relating to Alexandro O'Reilly and an Expedition sent out by him from New Orleans to Natchitoches, 1769-1770, edited by Dr. David K. Bjork; Louisiana Troops at the Occupation of Havana (1898), by John S. Kendall; Reminiscences of the Chevalier Bernard de Verges, an Early Colonial Engineer of Louisiana, by George C. H. Kernion; and West Feliciana: a Glimpse of its History, by Louise Butler.

#### WESTERN STATES

The eighteenth annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association was held at Detroit on April 30 and May 1 and 2, with one session at the William L. Clements Library in Ann Arbor. The presidential address, by Professor Frank H. Hodder, of Kansas, was on the Railroad Background of the Kansas-Nebraska Act. Among other papers read on that occasion we note one on Anglo-French Rivalry in the Ohio Country before 1754, by Professor A. T. Volwiler, of Wittenberg College; one on the Establishment of British Royal Government in the Mississippi Valley, by Professor Clarence E. Carter, of Miami University; one on the Pacific Railway Issue in Politics prior to the Civil War, by Professor R. R. Russell of the State Normal School of Kalamazoo; and one by Mr. R. M. Rieser, assistant attorney general of Wisconsin, on the Wisconsin-Michigan Boundary Dispute. The Detroit Public Library, the Detroit Historical Society, the College of the City of Detroit, the University of Michigan, and Mr. Henry Ford were on various occasions hosts of the Association.

The *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* for October, 1924, contains the History of Penal Institutions in Ohio to 1850, by Clara Belle Hicks; a study entitled Western Opinion of the War of 1812, by John F. Cady; and an account of the dedication, August 8, 1924, of the monument to George Rogers Clark on the site of the battle of Piqua, near Springfield, Ohio.

Mr. Charles E. Kennedy, a newspaper man of Cleveland, Ohio, has related the history of the development of Cleveland as he has seen it, in a volume to which he has given the title *Fifty Years of Cleveland* (Cleveland, Weidenthal Company).

In the March number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* are found an article by Bess V. Ehrmann, entitled the Lincoln Inquiry, being a record of investigations into the life of Lincoln in Spencer County, Indiana; a sketch of Henry Robertson, the Father of Benton County, by Elmore Barce; an article on the Cattle Industry in Benton County, by S. N. Geary; one on Historic Houses of Salem, by Martha S. Hobbes; and one on Gen. Charles Scott and his March to Ouiatenon, by J. W. Whickar.

The *Transactions* of the Illinois State Historical Society for the year 1924 contains, besides an account of the annual meeting in May of last year, the following historical papers: Early Mineral Explorations in the Mississippi Valley, 1540-1840, by Willard R. Jillson; Jean Baptiste de Vincennes and Joseph Hamilton Daviess, by Judge William N. Gemmill; the Mansion House of Cahokia and its Builder, Nicholas Jarrot, by Miss Margaret E. Babb; Harnessing the Illinois Streams in Pioneer Days, by Dr. Charles B. Johnson; John Locke Scripps, Lincoln's Campaign Biographer, by Mrs. Grace L. Scripps Dyche; and the Ancestry of Abraham Lincoln, by Rev. William E. Barton.

The contents of the April number of the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review* include an Account of the Second Voyage and the Death of Father Jacques Marquette, by Rev. Claude J. Dablon, S. J.; a Tribute from a Bigot to the Early Jesuit Missionaries in Illinois, by John L. Morris; Rt. Rev. Julian Benoit, his Early Life, by a pioneer priest; History in the Press, compiled and edited by Teresa L. Maher; Chicagou, the Grand Chief of the Illinois, by Joseph J. Thompson; and a continuation of Mr. Thompson's Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary History of Illinois.

*The War-Time Organization of Illinois*, by Marguerite E. Jenison, is vol. V. of the series *Illinois in the World War*, edited by Dr. Theodore C. Pease. "The present volume", says Dr. Pease in the editorial preface, "is an encyclopedic résumé of the civilian and military organization of Illinois, official, semi-official, and private, for the World War. It is designed to put the essential information about each of these organizations in convenient and accessible form. It is a handbook for the future historian and not a definitive history." The sixth volume of the series is *War Documents and Addresses*, likewise edited by Miss Jenison, selective,

but drawn from practically every phase of the state's activity in connection with the war.

*The Story of Illinois*, by Professor Theodore C. Pease, is a short history of the state based largely on the five-volume *Centennial History of Illinois* (McClurg).

The University of Chicago Press has brought out *The Story of the University of Chicago, 1890-1925*, by Dr. Thomas W. Goodspeed, whose *History of the University of Chicago* appeared in 1916.

The *Register* of the Kentucky State Historical Society has in the May issue the Madison County Tax Lists of 1792; a paper by Mrs. Katherine P. Caperton entitled a Partial List of those at Fort Boonesborough, largely a commentary on the list; one by Professor E. Merton Coulter on the Downfall of the Whig Party in Kentucky; and one by Dr. Willard R. Jillson on the Texas Movement in Kentucky (1820-1836).

*A Biography of James Kennedy Patterson, President of the University of Kentucky from 1869 to 1910* (Louisville, Westerfield-Bonte Company), prepared by Mabel H. Pollitt, in compliance with the will of President Patterson, is primarily a record of his forty years as president of the University of Kentucky, and at the same time is in large measure a history of the university during that period. The biography occupies just half the volume; the second half is a collection of the speeches and writings of President Patterson, mostly on educational themes.

Among the contents of the April number of the *Michigan History Magazine* are: the Chippewa Cession of Mackinac Island to George III., May 12, 1781, by L. O. Wolz; Fort Gratiot Turnpike, by William L. Jenks; and the Alger Movement of 1888, by Henry A. Haigh.

The *Burton Historical Collection Leaflet* for May contains a description of Detroit in 1793, written in 1834 by Rev. Oliver M. Spencer, who, on the earlier date, was brought to the British post at Detroit after being ransomed from Indian captivity.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has acquired a large mass of papers of the late Governor William R. Taylor, governor from 1873 to 1875. The society's *Calendar of Kentucky Papers* will soon be ready for distribution. In the September number of its magazine the society will begin the publication of a biography of the late Chief Justice William P. Lyon of the Wisconsin Supreme Court. It will run through four numbers and afterward be printed in a book.

The *Wisconsin Magazine of History* has in the March number a characteristically illuminating study by Professor Frederick J. Turner, entitled the Significance of the Section in American History. In the same number Dr. Joseph Schafer tells the story of Prohibition in Early Wisconsin, Miss Florence Bascom describes conditions at the University of Wisconsin in the period 1874-1887. Mrs. T. O. Bennet writes of Mail

Transportation in the Early Days, and Oscar H. Bauer offers some reminiscences which he calls *Annals of a Country Tradesman*. The *Journal of a World War Veteran*, Ira Lee Peterson, begun in December, is continued.

*Observations on the Ethnology of the Sauk Indians*, part II., *War Customs*, by Alanson Skinner, is a *Bulletin* of the Public Museum of the City of Milwaukee, May 11, 1925.

The *Minnesota History Bulletin*, having completed a decade, has resolved to change its character, and, to signalize the transformation, has elected to change its name to *Minnesota History, a Quarterly Magazine*. Each number of the magazine is to contain, besides scholarly contributions to knowledge, "some material designed to have a wider popular appeal or to be useful to teachers of Minnesota history in the schools", "a section of reprints of illuminating extracts from books of travel and other publications not generally accessible outside the largest libraries", and "a series of popular talks under the general heading of 'Radiograms of Minnesota History'". The months of issue will be March, June, September, and December. The March number includes an article by Wright T. Orcutt on the Minnesota Lumberjacks; one by the venerable Professor William W. Folwell, entitled *Minnesota in 1849*, an Imaginary Letter; and, under the general title *Minnesota as seen by Travellers*, a passage concerning Minnesota from the Englishman Charles Beadle's volume, *A Trip to the United States in 1887*. Under the heading "Radiograms of Minnesota History" is a radio talk by Willoughby M. Babcock, jr., on Sioux vs. Chippewa.

The October number of the *Annals of Iowa* reproduces, in facsimile of newspaper clippings, a series of articles written in 1839 by Judge David Rorer, over the signature "A Wolverine among the Hawkeyes", the articles which, it is said, fixed the sobriquet "Hawkeye" to the state of Iowa and its residents. A portrait of Judge Rorer forms the frontispiece to the magazine. This number prints also the Decree in Partition of the Half Breed Tract in Lee County, rendered by Chief Justice Charles Mason of the territorial supreme court of Iowa in 1840, together with a map of the tract, contributed, with explanatory notes, by Edgar R. Harlan.

Articles in the April number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* are: the Beginnings of Education in Iowa, by C. J. Fulton; Father De Smet and the Pottawattamie Indian Mission, by Frank A. Mullen; and the Legislative Department as provided by the Constitution of Iowa, by Carl H. Erbe.

The State Historical Society of Iowa has put to press a two-volume *History of the 168th Infantry*, prepared by Lieut. John H. Taber. The society has lately come into possession of a copy of a diary of G. Shipp, who travelled extensively in Iowa in 1867.



The Missouri Historical Society has received six bound volumes and 596 additional pages of manuscript relating to the plantations of El Destino and Chaminoux in Florida, including journals and records of overseers from 1747 to 1869.

Among the articles in the April number of the *Missouri Historical Review* are: the Building of a City (Springfield), by A. M. Haswell; In the Land of the Osages, Harmony Mission, by Mrs. W. W. Graves; and some recollections of B. Gratz Brown, by Daniel M. Grissom. The ninth of Walter B. Stevens's articles on the New Journalism in Missouri is concerned with the year 1880.

Articles in the April number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* are: the Federal Indian Policy in Texas, 1845-1860, by Lena C. Koch; California Emigrant Roads through Texas, by Mabelle E. Martin; and the Office of Adjutant-General in Texas, 1835-1881, by Clarence P. Denman. The Bryan-Hayes correspondence in this issue contains some letters (January, 1881-February, 1882) which cast interesting light upon the life and thought of the former President.

*A History of Texas*, in five volumes, by Louis J. Wortham, has appeared (Fort Worth, Wortham-Molyneaux Company).

*Making the Texas Constitution of 1876* (pp. 195), by Seth S. McKay, is a doctoral dissertation of the University of Pennsylvania. Mr. McKay lays the necessary groundwork for an understanding of the task before the convention and the manner in which it was handled, by setting forth the history of the state, as respects constitutional provisions, during the preceding decade. A like space (nearly forty pages) is devoted to the movement for a constitutional convention and the processes of assembling it. The survey of the convention (approximately seventy pages) is based on the journal and on newspaper reports, sometimes inadequate. There is a final chapter on the campaign for ratification, and a brief discussion of the working of the constitution in actual practice.

*The Development of Education in Texas*, by Frederick Eby, professor in the University of Texas, has been published by Macmillan, with an introduction by Professor William S. Sutton of the same university.

*The Agrarian Movement in North Dakota*, by Paul R. Fossum, is among the *Johns Hopkins University Studies in History and Political Science*.

The contents of the December number of the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* include La Harpe's First Expedition in Oklahoma, 1718-1719, being a segment of La Harpe's journal, contributed, with an introduction, by Anna Lewis, and with editorial notes by J. B. Thoburn; the Nineteenth Kansas Cavalry in the Washita Campaign (1868), by Col. Horace L. Moore, reprinted from the *Kansas Historical Collections*, vol. VI.; Bloomfield Academy and its Founder, Rev. John H. Carr, by Mrs. S. J. Carr; and Horace

P. Jones, Scout and Interpreter, by J. B. Thoburn. The April number has an account of the battle of Washita, by Paul Nesbitt; a paper on Oklahoma as a Part of the Spanish Dominion, 1763-1803, by Anna Lewis; and an address by Henry C. Keeling, My Experience with the Cheyenne Indians (a reprint). In this number is begun also a reprint of the *Journal of the General Council of the Indian Territory*, convened at Okmulgee, Sept. 27, 1870.

*Camp's Wyoming Round-Up* is an account, by Charles Camp, of the early days of the cattle industry in Wyoming, Nebraska, and northern Colorado (Charles Camp, P. O. Box 403, Greeley, Colo.).

Vol. IV. of the *Nevada State Historical Society Papers* (Reno, pp. xvi, 603) contains papers on the death of Major Ormsby, on the development of Reno, and on early theatrical attractions in Carson.

The contents of the April number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* include a continuation of J. O. Oliphant's articles on Old Fort Colville; some Information concerning the Establishment of Fort Colville, by William S. Lewis; an article by Judge F. W. Howay on Captain Simon Metcalfe and the Brig *Eleanora*; a note by Professor Edmond S. Meany concerning Vancouver's Centennial; and one by J. O. Oliphant concerning a file (almost complete) of the *North-West Tribune* (1880-1891), which he has recently discovered.

The March number of the *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* contains an article by Lewis A. McArthur on the Lakes of Oregon; Some Additional Notes upon Captain Colnett and the *Princess Royal*, by Judge F. W. Howay; and David Thompson's Narrative of the Discovery of the Source of the Columbia, with an introduction by T. C. Elliott.

Thomas C. Russell, 1734 Nineteenth Avenue, San Francisco, has brought out a reprint of Alfred Robinson's *Life in California before the Conquest*, with a foreword, notes, and corrections by himself.

The *Diary of Dr. Thomas Flint: California to Maine and Return, 1851-1855* (pp. 78), edited by Professor Waldemar Westergaard, is reprinted from the *Annual Publications* of the Historical Society of Southern California. There is a brief account of a journey from Maine to California by way of Panama, May to July, 1851, and a similar account of a journey back to Maine by the same route, begun in December, 1852; but the principal part of the diary; and that which constitutes its chief interest, is of the return to California with a flock of sheep.

#### CANADA

The Public Archives of Canada have received further additions, mainly of Townshend correspondence, to the collection donated by Sir Leicester Harmsworth. A calendar of the whole Northcliffe Collection is in course of preparation, and may be published before the end of the present year.

The February *Bulletin* of the Institute of Historical Research in London contains a paper by Dr. H. P. Biggar on the Archives at Ottawa, brief, but bringing matters more completely up to date than any preceding survey.

The *Canadian Historical Review* for December contains an address on the Teaching of the History and Geography of the British Empire, read before the British Association for the Advancement of Science at its meeting in Toronto last August, by Professor George M. Wrong, and a History of the Struggle over Laws of Canada, 1783-1791, by Frederic H. Soward. The March number presents Professor Wrong's paper on the Evolution of the Foreign Relations of Canada, read before the American Historical Association at Richmond last December, and an article on the Quebec Fur-traders and Western Policy, 1763-1774, by Miss Marjorie G. Reid. Documents of much value to the administrative and political history of Canada in 1855-1856, running through both numbers, are the letters of John Langton, appointed auditor general of Canada in the former year.

Two series of brief Canadian biographies are under way in the Dominion. The *Canadian Statesmen* series (Toronto, Macmillan) begins with a volume on Sir John Macdonald, by W. S. Wallace of the University of Toronto. The series entitled *Canadian Men of Action* (*ibid.*) opens with a volume on Sir Isaac Brock, and is continued by one on David Thompson, by C. N. Cochrane. Number III. is *Samuel de Champlain, Founder of New France*, by Professor Ralph Flenley.

The varied contents of the *Transactions*, vol. IX., of the Women's Canadian Historical Society include some reminiscences of George R. Blyth, entitled *Bytown, 1834, to Ottawa, 1854*; *Early Settlement of Meach Lake*, by Ethel P. Hope; *the First Missionaries of Hull*, by Louise Belisle; *Hugh Macdonell*, by Kate Casgrain; *the Founder of Toronto*, by Lucienne C. Roy; *Social Life in Old Quebec*, by Edith M. Maclean; *the Fur Trader's Better Half*, by Lawrence J. Burpee; *Sir William Johnson*, by Mary G. H. Foran; *the Iroquois, an Historical and Ethnological Sketch*, by F. W. Waugh; *the Naskopi Indians of Labrador and their Neighbors*, by the same writer; and *the Eskimos, their History and their Future*, by Diamond Jenness.

*Gibbon Wakefield and Canada subsequent to the Durham Mission, 1830-1842*, by Ursilla N. Macdonnell, constitutes *Bulletin* no. 49 of the Departments of History and Political and Economic Science in Queen's University, Kingston.

The *Life of Thomas D'Arcy McGee*, by Mrs. Isabelle Skelton (Gardenvale, Quebec, Garden City Press, pp. xvi, 554), commemorates the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of its subject (b. 1825, d. 1868) and, as is natural, dwells especially upon the ten fruitful years of his political life in Canada.

## AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

A useful addition to West Indian history is Col. Nemours's *Histoire Militaire de la Guerre d'Indépendance de Saint-Domingue*, vol. I., *La Campagne de Leclerc contre Toussaint-Louverture* (Paris, Berger, 1925, pp. viii, 284).

The March number of *Cuba Contemporánea* is principally occupied with selections from the writings of Manuel Sanguily y Garrit (1849-1925), preceded by a brief sketch and appreciation by Mario Guirol Moreno. Among the writings are: *El Descubrimiento de América*, an address delivered in 1892; *La Anexión de Cuba á los Estados Unidos*, a discussion of the subject in a letter to Fred M. Thompson of Emporia, Kans., Mar. 6, 1907; *El Panamericanismo*, an address delivered at a banquet given to Secretary Knox in 1912; and an article on Theodore Roosevelt published in the *Heraldo de Cuba* in January, 1919.

*Don José de San Martín, 1778-1850: a Study of his Career*, by Anna Schoellkopf, is published by the firm of Liveright.

---

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Lewis Spence, *The Origins of American Man* (Quarterly Review, April); Albert Isnard, *La Carte Pré-tendue de Christophe Colomb*, I. (Revue des Questions Historiques, April); G. P. Hammond, *The Desertion of Oñate's Colony from New Mexico* (Quarterly Journal of the University of North Dakota, January); G. Goyau, *Le P. Sébastien Racle* [corrected spelling, instead of Rasle or Râle] (Revue d'Histoire des Missions, September, 1924); Charles Moore, *The Stepfatherhood of George Washington*, III., IV. (Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine, April, May); Justus Hashagen, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Nordamerikanischen Erklärungen der Menschenrechte* (Zeitschrift für die Gesamte Staatswissenschaft, LXXVIII. 3-4); C. W. Alvord, *Politics in the Revolution* (American Mercury, June); Lieut. P. Auphan, *Les Communications entre France et l'Amérique pendant la Guerre de l'Indépendance Américaine* (La Revue Maritime, March); Gamaliel Bradford, *The Wife of the Traitor* [Mrs. Benedict Arnold] (Harper's Magazine, April); F. Frankfurter and J. M. Landis, *The Compact Clause of the Constitution: a Study in Inter-State Adjustments* (Yale Law Journal, May); H. M. Wilson, *Influence of the American Doctrine of Judicial Review on Modern Constitutional Development* (Constitutional Review, April); G. Bradford, *Theodosia Burr* (Atlantic Monthly, May); *id.*, *Dolly Madison* (Virginia Quarterly Review, April); Clive Day, *The Early Development of the American Cotton Manufacture* (Quarterly Journal of Economics, May); Camille Vallaux, *La Légende Napoléonienne aux Etats-Unis* (Mercure de France, January 15); Ed. von Wertheimer, *Ludwig Kossuth in Amerika* (Preussische Jahrbücher, March); W. H. Ellison, *Rejection of California Indian Treaties* [of

1851]: a *Study in Local Influence on National Policy* (Grizzly Bear, May, June); W. O. Stoddard, *Face to Face with Lincoln* (Atlantic Monthly, March); A. S. Roberts, *High Prices and the Blockade in the Confederacy* (South Atlantic Quarterly, April); L. von Schlözer, *Aus den Nordamerikanischen Briefen von Kurd von Schlözer an seinen Bruder* (Deutsche Rundschau, February); Francis Parsons, *A Lawyer of the Old School* [Edward J. Phelps] (Sewanee Review, April-June); J. H. Hammond, *Strong Men of the Wild West* (Scribner's Magazine, February, March); J. T. Thorson, *Icelandic Pioneers in North America* (Quarterly Journal of the University of North Dakota, January); J. T. Morse, jr., *Henry Cabot Lodge* (Harvard Graduates' Magazine, March); N. McL. Rogers, *Acadian Exiles in France* (Dalhousie Review, April); Comtesse de Reinach Foussemagne, *Lettres de Charlotte, Impératrice du Mexique* (Revue des Deux Mondes, February 15); R. L. Schuyler, *The Constitutional Claims of the British West Indies* (Political Science Quarterly, March); F. García Calderón, *Dictatorship and Democracy in Latin America* (Foreign Affairs, April); A. Teja Zabre, *Morelos and his Political Achievements* (Inter-America, February); C. García Prada, *The Historical Personality of the Republic of Colombia*, II., III. (*ibid.*, March, April).

